DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 335 UD 023 853

AUTHOR Etzioni, Amitai
TITLE Self-Discipline, Schools, and the Business Community.
INSTITUTION Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, DC. National Chamber Foundation.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 63p.; Project made possible by grants from Aetna Life and Casualty Company, American Telephone and Telegraph, Cabot Corporation Foundation, CIGNA Corporation, Combustion Engineering Inc., Middle South Services, Inc., and United Parcel Service.
AVAILABLE FROM National Chamber Foundation, 1615 H Street, N.W., Washington, DC. 20062 ($8.50 per copy plus $1.50 postage and handling).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Responsibility; *Discipline; *Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; Homework; Private Schools; Public Schools; *School Business Relationship; *School Effectiveness; School Role; *Self Control; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on self-discipline as a cornerstone in the educational development of a productive workforce and asserts that young people today are not developing a sufficient degree of self-discipline in the course of their education. Chapter I, an introduction, cites the economic costs to employers of poor academic preparation among young people entering employment and cites the threat to America's competitiveness posed by a poorly educated populace. Chapter II states the need for improvement efforts to move from a narrow focus on teaching to a more encompassing outlook on education, as an enterprise involving both cognitive and psychic development. Chapter III discusses the significance of inadequate self-discipline. Findings from the recent Coleman Report on public and private schools are cited and quantitative data are presented regarding factors said to be indicative of self-discipline: homework (number of hours per week), the effectiveness and fairness of school discipline (as perceived by students), and the level of teacher interest in students (as perceived by students). Chapter IV briefly considers the negative relationship between self-discipline and discipline enforced externally. Chapter V examines areas that must be addressed if educational reforms are to have an effect on self-discipline. These include (1) the importance of non-instructional school experiences; (2) enhancing classroom environment; (3) reducing external pressures placed on young people; (4) strengthening curricula; (5) improving student study habits; (6) increasing community involvement in the schools; and (7) removing burdensome government regulations. In conclusion, Chapter VI stresses that the schooling process should be viewed as an extracurricular activity with broad educational mandates, and calls for the business community to aid schools in helping to develop responsible employees and citizens. (GC)

ED249335

SELF-DISCIPLINE, SCHOOLS, AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. FORD
Natl Chamber Foundation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the National Chamber Foundation by

AMITAI ETZIONI

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

UD023853

© 1984 by the
National Chamber Foundation
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
(202) 463-5552
All Rights Reserved

This report reflects the views of the author on this subject. It does not necessarily represent, in whole or in part, the views of the National Chamber Foundation or the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was initiated and supported by the National Chamber Foundation of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I am grateful to Jack Marshall, Executive Director and Vice President of the National Chamber Foundation, and to John Volpe, Associate Chief Economist and Manager, Research Center, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for helping to bring this project about. Special thanks are due to Madeleine Hemmings for her encouragement, and to the advice of the U.S. Chamber's Council on Trends and Perspective. Finally, and most importantly, this project would not have been possible without some special analyses provided by Tom Hoffer, National Opinion Research Center, at the suggestion of James Coleman.

Amitai Etzioni
June 1984

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN MADE
POSSIBLE BY GRANTS FROM:

Aetna Life and Casualty Company
Hartford, Connecticut

American Telephone & Telegraph
New York, New York

Cabot Corporation Foundation
Boston, Massachusetts

CIGNA Corporation
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Combustion Engineering Inc.
Stamford, Connecticut

Middle South Services, Inc.
New Orleans, Louisiana

United Parcel Service
Greenwich, Connecticut

DR. AMITAI ETZIONI

Dr. Amitai Etzioni is the first University Professor of the George Washington University. He was Senior Advisor in the White House. For 20 years (1958-1978), he served as Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, part of the time as Chairman of the Department. He is the author of numerous books and articles, has been a consultant to government and business, and is the founder and director of the Center for Policy Research.

NATIONAL CHAMBER FOUNDATION

The National Chamber Foundation (NCF) is a Washington, D.C.-based public policy research organization. NCF is concerned with issues vital to the health of our economic system. Its goal is to gather authoritative information on specific problems facing the nation, analyze the data, and make recommendations for future policy initiatives.

As a nonprofit 501(c)(3) operating foundation, NCF finances its projects through the tax deductible contributions of corporations, foundations, and concerned individuals.

THE COUNCIL ON TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVE

The Council on Trends and Perspective is an advisory group to the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It informs the Board of emerging issues and developments that will have a major impact on business in the United States, and assists the Chamber in devising positive, business-oriented strategies to deal with national problems and issues.

NATIONAL CHAMBER FOUNDATION EDUCATION TASK FORCE MEMBERS

The following individuals, representing expertise in all aspects of business and education, make up the National Chamber Foundation's project advisory panel for *Self-Discipline, Schools and the Business Community.* The presence of their names on this report is testimony to their participation in the project and the invaluable aid they provided in the course of the study. It must be noted that this listing does not signify or imply endorsement of the views presented in this study, either by the advisory panel members or the companies, educational institutions or organizations which they represent.

Task Force Members

Dr. Joseph C. Burke
President
Plattsburgh State University
College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Donald M. Clark
President
National Association for
Industry-Education Cooperation

Mr. J.J. Donohue
Manager, Management Education
Western Electric Corporate Education Center

Dr. Frank N. Elliott
President
Rider College

Dr. Badi Foster
President
Aetna Institute for Corporate Education

Ms. Carole Garstang
Vice President, Education
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Edward M. Harris, Jr.
Vice President, Secretary,
and General Counsel
Pitney Bowes

Mr. George R. Hartshorn
Manager, Training Center
Ford Motor Company

Mr. Holom Head
Executive Vice President
Alabama Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Nick E. Heldreth
Vice President,
Industrial Relations
Pratt-Whitney

Ms. Madeleine Hemmings
Vice President for Policy
National Alliance for Business

Mr. John H.F. Hoving
President
The Hoving Group

Dr. Bernard H. List
Corporate Vice President
Training and Education
Texas Instruments

Mr. Peter J. Lombardi
President
Maryland Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Jerome M. Marco
Principal
Walt Whitman High School

Ms. Margaret A. Regan
Senior Vice President
New York City Chamber of
Commerce and Industry

Dr. Lois Rice
Senior Vice President for
Government Affairs
Control Data Corporation

Dr. Mary L. Tenopyr
Division Manager
Employee Research and
Development
American Telephone
Telegraph Company

Mr. Joseph Tranfo
Communications Department
United Parcel Service

Mr. Harry Wugalter
Manager, Communications
and Academic Affairs
Science Center
Rockwell International Corporation

Staff Representatives

Mr. Jack A. Marshall
Executive Director
and Vice President
National Chamber Foundation

Dr. John Volpe
Director
Council on Trends and Perspective

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL ON TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVE

Chairman

Mr. Frank L. Morsani
President
Automotive Management Services, Inc.

Council Members

Mr. V. J. Adduci
President and Chief Executive Officer
Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association

Mr. James C. Armstrong
Director, Corporate Policy Analysis
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Dr. Ramon C. Barquin
Manager, Public Affairs Programs
IBM Governmental Programs

Mr. Richard L. Berry
Senior Vice President
External Affairs Administration
Owens-Illinois Inc.

Mr. Gerald D. Blatherwick
Vice President, Public Relations
Southwestern Bell Corporation

Mr. John H. Book
President
Chase Bag Company

Mr. Louis W. Cabot
Chairman of the Board
Cabot Corporation

Ms. Anna C. Chennault
President
TAC International, Inc.

Mr. Edwin D. Dodd
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Owens-Illinois, Inc.

Mr. Edward Donley
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.

Dr. Frank N. Elliott
President
Rider College

Mr. Raymond P. Ewing
Issues Management Director
Allstate Insurance Company

Dr. Ellen Frost
Director, Government Programs
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Mr. Aaron J. Gellman
President
Gellman Research Associates, Inc.

Dr. Hourmouzis Georgiadis
Economic Consultant

Mr. Morton J. Getman
Attorney-at-Law

Mr. Roberto C. Goizueta
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
The Coca-Cola Company

Dr. W. Lee Hoskins
Senior Vice President and Chief Economist
Pittsburgh National Bank

Mr. John H.F. Hoving
President
The Hoving Group

Mr. John H. Johnson
President and Publisher
Johnson Publishing Company, Inc.

Mr. Howard H. Kehrl
Vice Chairman
General Motors Corporation

Mr. George H. Kuper
Executive Director
Manufacturing Studies Board
National Research Council
National Academy of Sciences

Mr. Robert B. Nicholas
Vice President of Finance and Planning
Aetna Life and Casualty

Mr. Elliot D. Ranard
Director, Planning and Analysis
Combustion Engineering Inc.

Hon. Myer Rashish
Rashish Associates, Inc.

Mr. Warren L. Serenbetz
Chief Executive Officer
Interpool

Mr. Ronald K. Shelp
Vice President & Director
American International Group, Inc.

Mr. Frank G. Smith, Jr.
President and Chief Executive Officer
Middle South Services, Inc.

Mr. M. Tabuchi
President
Mitsui and Company, USA

Mr. George Tillquist
Director, Planning
Corporate Planning Division
Atlantic Richfield Company

Mr. Raymond J. Waldmann
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Transnational Investments

Mr. Frank A. Weil
Partner
Wald, Harkrader, and Ross

Mr. Carter A. Weiss
Public Issues Coordinator
J.C. Penney Company, Inc.

Mr. John C. Yoder
Executive Vice President
The Work-Out Company

Staff Representative

Dr. John Volpe
Director
Council on Trends and Perspective

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

OVERVIEW i

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. One Consequence: Economic Costs 1
B. The Need To Improve Human Capital 3
C. Focus: Self-Discipline 4

II. EDUCATION VERSUS TEACHING 5

A. The State Of American School 5
B. The Importance Of Non-Cognitive Factors 6

III. THE PIVOTAL ROLE OF SELF-DISCIPLINE 7

A. The Significance Of Psychic Deficiencies 7
B. Inadequate Self-Discipline: An Example 7
C. Observational Data 8
D. Statistical Data 9
E. Homework And Responsibility 24

IV. SELF-DISCIPLINE AND DISCIPLINE 31

A. Self-Discipline And Structure 31

V. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS 33

A. The Importance Of School Experiences 33
B. Classroom Environment And Character Traits 34
C. External Factors 37
D. Strengthening Curricula 37
E. Promoting Self-Discipline: Other Measures 37
F. Removing Burdensome Regulations 39

VI. IN CONCLUSION 40

FOOTNOTES
REFERENCES
NATIONAL CHAMBER FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Corporate Assessment Of Skill Deficiencies 2

Table 2 Corporate Cost Category Ranking 3

Table 3 Means And Standard Deviations For Sophomore Test Scores In Public And Private Schools: Spring 1980 12

Table 4 Means And Standard Deviations For Senior Test Scores In Public And Private Schools: Spring 1980 13

Table 5 Sophomores: Teacher Interest In Students 15

Table 6 Seniors: Teacher Interest In Students 16

Table 7 Teacher Interest In Students Rated "Good" Or "Excellent" By Students 16

Table 8 Sophomores: Effectiveness Of Discipline 18

Table 9 Seniors: Effectiveness Of Discipline 19

Table 10 Effectiveness Of Discipline Rated "Good" Or "Excellent" By Students 20

Table 11 Sophomores: Fairness Of Discipline 20

Table 12 Seniors: Fairness Of Discipline 21

Table 13 Fairness Of Discipline Rated "Good" Or "Excellent" By Students 21

Table 14 Percent Of Schools Rated "Good" Or "Excellent" On Both Effectiveness And Fairness Of Discipline By School Type 22

Table 15 Assessments Of Disciplinary Problems By Administrators And Students In Public And Private Schools: Spring 1980 22

Table 16 Average Time Spent On Homework By Sophomores And Seniors In Public And Private Schools: Spring 1980 24

Table 17 7-10 Hours Of Homework In Schools Rated "Excellent" In Teacher Interest By School Type 25

Table 18 7-10 Hours Of Homework In Schools Rated "Excellent" In Effectiveness Of Discipline By School Type 26

Table 19 7-10 Hours Of Homework In Schools Rated "Excellent" In Fairness Of Discipline By School Type 26

Table 20 Percentage Of Seniors In Public And Private Schools Reporting They Have Completed Selected Academic Courses [a]: Spring 1980 27

Table 21 Percentage Of Seniors In Public And Private Schools Where Selected Academic Courses Are Offered Who Have Taken These Courses : Spring 1980 28

Table 22 Correlations Of Measures Conducive To Effective Learning And Good Teaching 29

Table 23 Summary Statistics For The Stepwise Regression Analysis 36

Table 24 Importance To School District Policy And Implementation Of Selected Activities For Improving High School Academic Achievement By Region: Fall 1982 38

OVERVIEW

Periodically, a truth will enter the collective consciousness of a nation, and so it was with education.

For a variety of reasons, and after an abundance of signals, parents, teachers, employers, social commentators, business leaders, elected officials, and representatives of a wide range of public and private institutions and organizations pronounced their concern that the American educational system was not performing in a way that best served the present and future needs of America. In the ensuing months of debate, that concern has been translated into data documenting the shortcomings of American education, analyses of reasons for these failings, and recommendations for initiatives to address the problem. Numerous studies and commissions have produced excellent reports, each focusing on the need for changes in educational policy.

Despite all the attention and debate, one critical aspect of education has remained in the shadows: *the need for our educational system to develop self-discipline and other work-related character traits, and its apparent failure to do so*. The National Chamber Foundation, together with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Council on Trends and Perspective, asked the noted sociologist Amitai Etzioni to examine this one overlooked factor. After more than a year of thought and research, he presented his analysis to NCF and to the Council in the report, *Self Discipline, Schools, and the Business Community*.

This report is available to the public and all who wish to read it. But because of the undeniable fact that most schoiarly essays reach a small audience, and because the subject of Dr. Etzioni's report deserves wide attention and a more central role in the policy debate than it has received so far, we feel it is important to state, briefly, the reasons that self-discipline is part of the equation for national educational improvement, to speculate upon why it has been neglected, and to summarize Dr. Etzioni's observations.

Education: More Than Teaching

Professor Etzioni's analysis begins by making the distinction between education and teaching. Typically, policy-makers react with yawns to this sort of discussion, and consign it to the category of irrelevancies to be debated by semanticists and social scientists. But in this instance, the failure to make the distinction can handicap our ability to address the needs of our nation's students.

Teaching is the process of transmitting knowledge and basic skills. Education includes this process, but also includes the process of developing the ability to use acquired knowledge and basic skills effectively in life situations. Part of this ability – a large part – is determined by the evolution of one's values, mentality, and character.

When we examine the recommendations and conclusions made by the studies and commissions that have recently examined American education, we find that they are overwhelmingly aimed at *teaching*, and do not focus as much attention upon the broader aspects of education. The reasons for this are clear:

- Test scores and grades are the usual yardstick by which we measure the effectiveness of our schools and the achievements of our students. Test scores and grades are directly related to teaching.

- While teaching effectiveness is at least partially susceptible to measurement, quantitative and qualitative assessments of the other components of education are imperfect at best.

- The studies, reasonably and predictably, have focused upon the portion of education – teaching – that is undeniably within the control of the schools. The responsibility for education, on the other hand, rests with many institutions: the family, peer groups, the church, and society at large, as well as the schools.

It is this last fact that may be especially responsible for

the omission of character formation and "self-discipline" from the current education debate. If this is an aspect of the problem that cannot be solved *solely* in the schools, then why address it in the context of school improvement? The answer lies in the importance of the problem. Our current concern about education has been sparked by the realization that too many graduates of the American school system are not capable of performing productively in the work place. This has ominous implications for our future as a nation and as a society. If the portion of the education process we call "character development" is part of the problem, it needs to be part of the solution. If our schools are part of that solution, they need to know about it. Dr. Etzioni does not deny that this may be the most difficult part of the problem to address; nor does he maintain that the schools alone can solve it. He only says, correctly, that it is too important a part of the total issue to be ignored.

Self-Discipline: A Cornerstone

The report states that self-discipline is a cornerstone in the educational construction of a productive worker:

> The relevance of personality development to the ability to work is elementary; young persons who cannot cope effectively with authority figures, rules, and routines in schools cannot be expected to do so on most jobs.

There are few, if any, who will seriously dispute this. More controversial, perhaps, is Etzioni's second contention:

> ...that large parts of the present generation of Americans are psychically underdeveloped, that they have insufficient ability to control impulse, mobilize ego, and to be able to sustain the work ethic.

As Etzioni himself notes, this is not the sort of assertion that can be conclusively proven; there is nothing like the neat trail of SAT scores to measure falling levels of self-discipline. But in the media, in daily observation, in the experiences of employers and those who work with students entering the work force, there is abundant support for this statement. Etzioni's two contentions, that self-discipline is a vital component of the productive worker, and that our young are not developing a sufficient degree of self-discipline in the course of their education, point to two conclusions:

1. Research is necessary on the role of self-discipline in the schools and the workplace.

2. We should not wait for the research before we include the need for self-discipline in our deliberations on educational policy.

A related and important aspect of self-discipline is its role in the acquisition of cognitive skills. The lack of self-discipline on the part of the student can counteract effective teaching, as learning requires a substantial amount of concentration, control of impulse, self-motivation, and ability to face and overcome stress:

> Thus, the root problem is not that millions of high school graduates have great difficulty in reading, writing, and 'rithmetic; these all too common deficiencies are *consequences* of insufficient self-discipline, of inadequate ability to mobilize self and to commit. These graduates enter the adult world *twice* handicapped. They suffer both from continued psychic underdevelopment and from the inadequate cognitive preparation this underdevelopment helped to cause.

This is especially relevant in light of the avalanche of recommendations for school improvement now toppling down from every tower. It suggests that these recommendations, while sound and valid, may not accomplish their objectives if self-discipline, the cornerstone, is not firmly in place. In essence, Etzioni is saying that no matter how well you make the fuel or how vigorously you pump it in, the car will not run well if the engine is badly built. He is exhorting educators to work on the engine, the students' characters and work attitudes.

Etzioni's study also suggests that self-discipline may play an important role in promoting equality of opportunity. While more research is needed to confirm the thesis, his data indicates that students attending schools with structures and disciplinary procedures conducive to the development of self-discipline achieve at a higher level than students in schools where self-discipline is less emphasized. The data showed this occurrence regardless of students' economic, social or

cultural backgrounds. An environment which encourages self-discipline may provide students with a powerful tool for overcoming any economic or social disadvantages.

As we have discussed, most of the recent education studies have concentrated on ways to improve the *quality* of education. Yet there is concern that these analyses neglect a commitment to equality – using our education system to help all students, regardless of their backgrounds, to prosper economically and socially. By including the development of stronger self-discipline in our reform efforts, society may be able to fulfill both of these goals that have so often conflicted in the public policy arena.

First Steps, And The Business Role

The business community's stake in the nation's education dilemma is obviously very large, and a number of the studies and commission reports that have come out recently note this fact. The greater question is what business can really do to improve our nation's education that business has not been doing. Already, business does a tremendous volume of education on its own, and contributes millions annually to schools and other institutions of learning. Corporate community programs like those examined in the February 1983 report, *Basic Skills in the U.S. Work Force*, demonstrate that the business community has also been active implementing education programs on the local level.

Dr. Etzioni's thesis and supporting research points to the importance of another major area of business participation in educational improvement. It is a theme that was echoed by the diverse membership of NCF's task force for the project. Business leaders must communicate the needs of the business community to educators in a constructive way.

Educators are certainly eager to take whatever measures are necessary in order to ensure a productive future for their students. *If business leaders agree that a lack of self-discipline constitutes a major problem for new entrants into the work force, they must make this problem known to educators, school boards, and policy-makers*. So far, they have not: the alarm of the business community has been phrased in terms of illiteracy, cognitive deficiencies, and shortages of skilled workers. These warnings are both useful and appropriate, but they may not be enough. Etzioni makes a compelling case that self-discipline deficiencies are a crucial part of the problem as well. Dialogue, and placing the self-discipline issue squarely in the midst of the education debate, is the first step toward solving the problem.

Another step is realism. As Dr. Etzioni points out, the schools alone cannot instill adequate self-discipline. Indeed, viewing education from the context of self-discipline shows more clearly the societal roots of our educational inadequacies. Self-discipline, sacrifice, and the work ethic have declined as American societal values. It can be argued that schools are, at best, the last line of defense. Families, peer groups, and America as a society must join schools in the effort to build the character of our young. This does not relieve schools of their responsibility to do their share, but it places their role in the proper perspective.

Clearly, part of the schools' share in developing self-discipline can be accomplished through better use of homework. An increase in the amount of homework is such a well-worn remedy for education ills that it has achieved the status of a cliche. But unlike many of the recent reports that have echoed this refrain, Etzioni is advocating homework "not because it provides more hours to pump information into pupils, but because it both encourages and measures the development of self-discipline and associated good working habits". By emphasizing this function of homework, Etzioni suggests that homework needs to be devised, not solely according to content, but with regard to the lessons that the process of completing it will teach.

Although he feels that many of them do not employ homework sufficiently, Dr. Etzioni does not place blame for education deficiencies on the schools, but rather indicts the external demands that interfere with their performance. Among these he lists:

1. The need to make up for necessary pre-school education that millions of families ignore.

2. The curriculum demands of various well-intentioned interest groups.

3. Lack of support from parents in maintaining attendance and encouraging completion of homework.

4. Restrictions on the ability of schools to remove or discipline disruptive students.

5. Excessive paperwork and over-regulation.

If we are to ask the schools to place greater emphasis on self-discipline, Etzioni reasons, we must lighten their burden in other respects. As an ally in the effort to do so, the business community can have a significant impact.

Conclusion: A Factor, Not A Panacea

Self-discipline is an important by-product of the education process. It must be factored in, together with all the other elements, if our re-examination of America's schools is to be complete and productive. American business can assist this process materially by focusing attention on deficiencies in the work force.

That, in essence, is the message that the National Chamber Foundation and the Council on Trends and Perspective wished to convey through their sponsorship of Dr. Etzioni's research. To interpret Dr. Etzioni's work as a statement that self-discipline is a panacea for the ills of American education would be a mistake, a foolish one. We recommend Dr. Etzioni's work to those within and outside the business community, as a valuable companion piece to the recent national studies and reports on education. The need for self-discipline has a logical place in deliberations over educational reform. Dr. Etzioni has given the business community a start in articulating that place. We trust that the public, policy-makers, and educators will give the concept a good and just hearing.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is now becoming evident that the American education system is not developing the necessary degree of quality in its graduates. The majority of young people who present themselves for employment today cannot read a blueprint, or cope with a maintenance manual, write a coherent memorandum, or compute. Those who can often lack the most basic analytical skills, or the ability to organize or plan. As the National Assessment of Educational Progress reports:

> The gap between the number of highly skilled workers needed and the number of students preparing for higher-level jobs is widening. Clearly, we are not cultivating the raw materials, our future workers, who will be vital both for economic progress and ultimately for economic survival.[1]

A. One Consequence: Economic Costs

This conclusion was confirmed in a 1982 study of the Center for Public Resources, which surveyed numerous large and medium-sized companies to determine the level of preparedness of young people entering the work force. A majority of the companies surveyed said that basic skill deficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics existed for the majority of the job categories listed in the survey.[2] For example, half the companies surveyed said that skilled and semi-skilled employees had trouble with math problems that involved fractions or decimals. Fifty percent reported that people hired for managerial and supervisory positions could not write whole paragraphs without grammatical and spelling errors. Forty percent of the companies said that the secretaries they hired had difficulty reading at the level required by their work.[3] Table 1 breaks down the skill deficiencies by skill and job category and also by size of the company reporting the deficiency.[4]

Table 1
CORPORATE ASSESSMENT OF SKILL DEFICIENCIES

% indicates percent of responses indicating at least one degree of deficiency.
(%) indicates percent of minimum one degree deficiency which are two degree deficiencies.

	Reading	Writing	Speaking/ Listening	Mathematics	Science	Reasoning
Secretarial/graduate						
Medium companies	43%(5%)	59%(19%)	57%(7%)	46%(–)	25%(–)	47%(14%)
Large companies	38%(–)	48%(14%)	49%(6%)	43%(16%)	20%(–)	38%(3%)
Clerical/non-graduate						
Medium companies	90%(11%)	38%(34%)	86%(17%)	37%(17%)	N/A	37%(–)
Large companies	67%(50%)	67%(25%)	50%(33%)	33%(–)	N/A	29%(–)
Labor/skilled and semi-skilled						
Medium companies	37%(–)	58%(–)	31%(15%)	51%(14%)	30%(10%)	39%(–)
Large companies	39%(12%)	37%(6%)	47%(7%)	67%(18%)	56%(23%)	52%(7%)
Labor/unskilled						
Medium companies	35%(–)	–(–)	36%(–)	18%(–)	–(–)	18%(–)
Large companies	37%(–)	36%(–)	48%(7%)	38%(–)	27%(–)	20%(–)
Technical						
Medium companies	49%(–)	40%(21%)	46%(–)	69%(12%)	56%(–)	54%(–)
Large companies	55%(3%)	45%(–)	47%(19%)	50%(16%)	44%(10%)	54%(6%)
Managerial						
Medium companies	29%(–)	60%(8%)	36%(12%)	35%(17%)	17%(–)	43%(–)
Large companies	36%(–)	76%(12%)	57%(21%)	41%(–)	29%(–)	44%(–)
Supervisory						
Medium companies	67%(–)	100%(–)	100%(34%)	67%(–)	34%(–)	67%(–)
Large companies	27%(–)	56%(–)	69%(67%)	44%(–)	17%(–)	69%(–)
Service						
Medium companies	8%(–)	15%(–)	58%(14%)	25%(–)	N/A	31%(–)
Large companies	35%(8%)	7%(–)	63%(–)	28%(29%)	N/A	33%(9%)
Maintenance/Custodial						
Medium companies	20%(–)	–(–)	40%(–)	20%(–)	40%(–)	40%(50%)
Large companies	33%(–)	10%(–)	27%(–)	–(–)	–(–)	18%(–)
Accounting/Bookkeeping						
Medium companies	50%(–)	83%(–)	50%(–)	67%(–)	N/A	20%(–)
Large companies	27%(–)	14%(–)	14%(–)	57%(–)	N/A	27%(–)
Sales/Credit						
Medium companies	–(–)	20%(–)	20%(–)	20%(–)	N/A	20%(–)
Large companies	23%(–)	31%(–)	50%(11%)	46%(33%)	N/A	37%(–)

Source: *Basic Skills in the U.S. Work Force* (New York: Center for Public Resources, Annex X).

These problems impose a great cost on the economy. A decrease in general productivity was listed as the most serious consequence of skill deficiencies among young workers by 41 of the companies surveyed. Another 24 listed the need for extra management and supervisory time as the greatest cost imposed by the skills gap. Twenty-three percent cited a decrease in overall product quality as the most severe consequence.

Table 2 summarizes the corporations' evaluations of the impact of poor training in basic skills.[5] Only a few companies were able to provide actual dollar estimates of the costs of the skills gap. One company estimated that it cost $250,000 per year due to rework and materials waste. Another said it spent $250,000 per year on remedial training and instruction.[6] Clearly, the overall costs to the economy are very large indeed.

Table 2
CORPORATE COST CATEGORY RANKING

Rank	General Productivity	Product Quality	Worker Safety	Management/ Supervision Time	Time and Effort to Increase Skills	Other
1	41%**	21%	3%	24%	6%	4%
2	29%	26%	4%	28%	11%	2%
3	23%	21%	9%	32%	12%	1%
4	2%	19%	22%	12%	39%	1%
5	2%	7%	50%	5%	34%	2%
6	–	9%	82%	–	–	9%

*Includes "lost sales," "turnover," and "customer dissatisfaction."
**Percentages refer to the percent of responding companies listing the cost category as the rank specified (e.g., 41% of companies ranking a first priority ranked "general productivity" as No. 1, 21% ranked "product quality" as No. 1).

Source: *Basic Skills in the U.S. Work Force* (New York: Center for Public Resources, Annex X).

B. The Need To Improve Human Capital

Of less direct concern, but not less important, is that the same underprepared graduates of our schools also make rather poor citizens, inadequate members of the community we all must inhabit. Nor do they add to the defense of the country. If British wars were won at Eaton, ours might be lost in the public school system.

In recent years, great attention has been paid to investment, capital, R&D – all vital elements of a strong economy. But the more these are attended to, e.g., via various tax cuts, the more the human capital element stands out as in need of improvement. A former senior staff member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce put it well:

> More and more business leaders are clearly realizing that a significant element of America's economic success is determined by the education offered by America's schools. Schools are the social institution responsible for creating habits of productive work, knowledge and understanding with which to make sound judgments and information necessary to perform useful work.

Employers hire employees because they need them to make their organizations go. The quality of the available human resource will determine how successfully one organization competes with another and ultimately how well the United States competes in international markets.

Beyond labor free supply is another problem. Those who are not well prepared for work become an enormous burden on corporate and individual taxpayers through the country's entitlement program. Worse, as the actual number of young people entering the work force declines drastically in the

> next 20 years, it is rapidly becoming imperative that our society find much more efficient ways to prepare a much greater proportion of them for work, or we will not have an adequate work force for a long run economic recovery and growth.[7]

This theme was echoed by a recent *Business Week* editorial entitled, "Education is Industry's Business", which urged the business community to aid in the effort to revitalize American education:

> Estimates are that the country will need 15 million or so new people in the work force during the next decade, and most of these people are now in school. A lot of them may show up at factory, laboratory, or office doors poorly prepared for the jobs they will be expected to perform. This would be a calamity, and business should do what it can to prevent it – both for its own good and for the good of the country.
>
> A spate of recent studies, most recently that of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, has detailed shortcomings of U.S. education from kindergarten to college. North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt, Jr., who co-chaired the task force, says flatly: 'If the business community wants better employees or jobs for their own kids, they had better realize that they have a role to play as well.'

The Business-Higher Education Forum has also called for increased attention to the preparation of the work force of the future, and warned that improving America's competitiveness depends on education as well as on economic and governmental initiatives.

C. Focus: Self-Discipline

The following report, based on a limited conceptual effort, does *not* seek to deal with all or even most of the problems associated with human capital. Much of this is studied elsewhere, and much remains to be studied. Instead, the study focuses on *one* key factor, both because it is hypothesized to be of cardinal importance and because it has been much less often studied than the others. The study focuses on the pivotal role of *self-discipline*.

II. EDUCATION VERSUS TEACHING

Social sciences see education as much more encompassing than schooling (or teaching). Beyond the transmission of knowledge and the development of skills, education embraces character formation, the evolution of one's values and mentality. And, it cannot be stressed enough, in the view of many social scientists, that the experiences generated by schools are as important to education as cognitive inputs. For example, the data strongly suggest that whether teachers (and parents) smoke or not affects their pupils' (offspring's) smoking more than lectures, preaching, slides, and brochures on the subject. According to one albeit limited study, if one parent is an alcoholic, chances are 35 times higher that their kids will grow up to be alcoholics. If both parents are alcoholics, their children are 400 times more likely to be alcoholics than children of other parents.

Education is carried on by all persons in positions of authority. Such people provide role models which are a source of emulation, i.e., of nonrational learning.. But education is much more. The *total* setup – leaders, peers, the structure of the situation – provides educational experiences which affect character, values, and mentality, apart from skills and knowledge, for better or for worse.

A. The State Of American Schools

It is a commonplace to suggest that American schools are a deficient institution. Reports abound of rampant violence, drug abuse, and alcoholism; of teacher "burnout"; of disappointed parents and resentful taxpayers; of low test scores; of both long delays in adopting new teaching materials and methods, and a rush to embrace unproven fashions in the teaching of subjects from math to reading.

My readings of the data on school performance suggest that the criticisms of schools are, on the one hand, too sweeping, and on the other hand, misfocused. Violence and highly disruptive behavior are serious problems, but only in a small minority – less than one-fourth – of the nation's schools. Another segment of the schools, whose number is difficult to estimate, is seriously damaged by poor teaching and by a high degree of bureaucratization. But at least half of the schools seem to be doing a creditable to excellent job.

It is a cliche to lament the decline in reading, writing, and other school achievements, as well as in Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. However, there are some indications that the low point has already been passed, with both local and national scores slowly starting to rise. The *National Assessment of Educational Progress* reports that reading scores for nine-year olds increased 3.9 between 1971 and 1980 – and reading scores for black nine-year olds went up 9.9 for the same period.[10]

While one cannot deny that problems exist, the data do not show that "young Americans" are functionally illiterate, or that they leave school without basic skills, or that today's high school diploma is meaningless. Such statements and many similar ones about schools in general are much too sweeping.

Aside from being too broad, the criticisms focus on the wrong issue. Cognitive learning is the preoccupation of most school critics. This preoccupation is revealed by those who urge that kids not be graduated, nor promoted from class to class, unless they demonstrate "minimum competence" in certain skills. It is also revealed by those who oppose such educational policy on the ground that it is biased against minorities or enforces an all-too-low standard. Cognitive learning is also the focus of those who favor a "core" curriculum, or plenty of electives, or the use of phonics as the salvation of reading, or of those who advocate "sight reading", and so on.

Although learning to read has attracted more widespread public attention, learning mathematics has also engendered growing concern, as quantitative concepts have gained prominence in more and more fields, and as math as well as verbal SAT scores have fallen. With math as with reading, most of the "solutions" have focused on improving cognitive skills. While such improvement is undoubtedly called for, noncognitive elements also need attention. Many students become convinced that math is beyond their understanding, for instance.

B. The Importance Of Non-Cognitive Factors

Sheila Tobias, who has worked intensively with students and adults who have given up on math, cites research indicating that by age 17, a majority of all students have developed negative feelings about learning math. Among the factors that contribute to what she terms "math anxiety", Tobias mentions passive acceptance of the myth of a "mathematical mind", distrust of intuition, dependence on the teacher for direction, inability to handle frustration, and panic in response to pressure for the "right" answer. None of these has to do with cognitive skills or intelligence; all are matters of character or personality. They not only interfere with cognitive learning, they also lead students to stop trying to learn math, and to avoid math courses and fields of study that obviously require competence with numbers.

A study by Christopher Jencks concludes: "Taken together, non-cognitive measures explained at least as much of the variance in men's status and earnings as test scores did... The relevant traits are largely independent of both cognitive skills and parental status".[12]

Charles E. Silberman's *Crises in the Classroom*, which is based on a three-and-a-half year study commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation, is one of the more interesting books on education written in the Seventies. In it, he shows considerable appreciation for the impact that the totality of the school experience has on children, above and beyond the transmission of skills and knowledge. He writes:

> The way we do things...shapes values more directly and effectively than the way we talk about them.... Children are taught a host of lessons about values, ethics, morality, character, and conduct every day of the week, less by content of the curriculum than by the way schools are organized, the ways teachers and parents behave, the way they talk to children and to each other, the kinds of behavior they approve or reward, and the kinds they disapprove of or punish.[13]

Thus, he concludes, "What educators must realize...is that how they teach and how they act may be more important than what they teach".[14]

In their preoccupation with the cognitive, most parents and educators have ignored the importance to schooling of psychic development. It ought to be the first criterion we use in assessing schools: their contribution to the development of character or personality, to the formation of habits of thought and behavior which enable the student not only to acquire cognitive skills but also to act constructively in any situation. Of particular importance, I believe, is one trait, *self-discipline*.

III. THE PIVOTAL ROLE OF SELF-DISCIPLINE

A significant proportion of the children who enter American schools each year seem to be psychically underdeveloped. Their families have not helped them mature to the point where they can function effectively in a school, relate constructively to its rules, authorities, and "work" discipline.

A. The Significance Of Psychic Deficiencies

Many schools seem to add psychic damage to the psychic deficiencies new pupils import from their homes. These schools do little to develop underdeveloped personalities, and quite often provide opportunities for further maladjustment. As a result, many young people are unable, for psychic reasons, first to learn effectively in the schools, and then to function effectively in the adult world of work, community, and citizenship. Thus, the root problem is not that millions of high school graduates have great difficulties in reading, writing, and 'rithmetic; these all-too-common deficiencies are *consequences* of insufficient self-discipline, of inadequate ability to mobilize self and to commit. These graduates enter the adult world *twice* handicapped. They suffer both from continued psychic underdevelopment, *and* from the inadequate cognitive preparation this underdevelopment helped to cause.

The significance of psychic deficiencies as impediments to cognitive learning and to the acquisition of cognitive skills can hardly be overstated. The relevance of personality development to the ability to work is elementary; young persons who cannot cope effectively with authority figures, rules, and routines in schools cannot be expected to do so on most jobs.

There is no incontestable evidence to prove that large parts of the present generation of Americans are psychically underdeveloped, that they have insufficient ability to control impulse, mobilize ego, and sustain the work-ethic. An account of the reasons no such data are available would require a long aside about the problems of social science research in general, and psychological and educational studies in particular. It would include such issues as the tendency of theory and empirical work to diverge, the difficulties involved in conducting experimental work with human beings and in generalizing from lab to "field" (i.e., reality) conditions, and the shortage of resources available to the social sciences.

And even then, another, even longer "review of the literature" would be required, to see what various limited studies do suggest, why the findings do not necessarily complement each other, and what further lines of investigation must be followed before solid conclusions can be drawn. All this needs to be done, but it cannot be done here. Because of data limitation, my discussion of the psychic underdevelopment of many young Americans, its effects on schools, the effects of schools on it, and in turn on the adult world, must be treated as an hypothesis confirmed only in part.

B. Inadequate Self-Discipline: An Example

To return to the substance of my argument, let us look first at a simple incident. A young secretary, recently hired, was asked to use the Yellow Pages of the telephone directory. When she was unable to do so, it became evident that she did not command the alphabet, nor did she understand the principles of categorization and subcategorization involved.

Such inability would usually be considered an example of cognitive deficiency, of poor teaching, if not low I.Q. However, if one asks why it is difficult to teach someone a list of 26 items and the principles of a very simple index, one soon realizes that something more is amiss than that no one ever provided the needed time and effort. Nor could it be a question of I.Q. for most pupils, because so little comprehension or intelligence is involved.

Think what it would take you to memorize, say, a telephone number of 26 digits – a considerable amount of effort, but not cognitive effort; instead, concentration, control of impulse, self-motivation, and ability to face and overcome stress (in order to resist distractions and accept the "routine" work involved in memorizing), are required. This element of psychic organization, or capacity to mobilize and commit psychic energy to a task, is what those who are not learning well seem to me to be most lacking. It is what seems to account for

their "inability" to do elementary computation (i.e., to memorize a few rules and discipline one's self to adhere to them), or to write a coherent paragraph (i.e., to remember the rules of punctuation, that sentences have nouns, etc.). We are dealing not with effective writing, but with using correct English grammar.

Looking at the other side of the coin, a study by psychiatrists George and Caroline Vaillant concludes that children best able to absorb "industriousness" at a young age were likely to succeed in the work world. Their study continued one which was begun in the 1940s by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. The Gluecks interviewed more than 400 boys aged 11 to 16 from a high-crime neighborhood, and scored each on whether he worked, took part in school activities, clubs, and so forth. They also assigned extra points to boys whose grades in school were higher than might be predicted from their IQs, showing that they applied themselves to their studies. These same individuals were followed and reinterviewed over the years, the last interview being conducted by the Vaillants when the group's average age was 47.

Childhood industriousness turned out to be better correlated with working success than any other variable – including intelligence, social class, or family situation. The 45 men who had been the most industrious as children were 16 times less likely to have suffered prolonged periods of unemployment and were five times more likely to be well paid for their work than the 67 men with the lowest industriousness scores. The low industry group also had higher mortality rates and experienced greater difficulty in interpersonal relationships.[15]

Thus, for work as well as for other areas, the value of an early inculcation of the ability to apply oneself and work hard is important. The evidence presented below will show that the most successful schools strive to implant these abilities in their students.

C. Observational Data

An informal account comes from Robert Benjamin[16], who searched out and observed "maverick schools", nonselective elementary schools that were highly successful (at least half the sixth graders were reading at or above grade level), even though they were in poor urban neighborhoods (at least 60% of the kids were eligible for free lunches). These schools, he found, showed unmistakable marks of structure: clear goals, high expectations, monitoring of students' progress, and frequent use of tests. They possess "an ethos, a climate of high standards and high expectations".[17] Beasley Academic Center, on Chicago's South Side, for example:

> ...makes explicit the behavior expected of students, and it rewards them accordingly. Responsibilities are stressed over rules. And those rules that exist are clearly stated and kept to a minimum, enabling consistent and reasonable enforcement.[18]

Benjamin puts strong emphasis on instruction, "what happens when the teacher closes the classroom door".[19] He concludes that educational research and classroom observations point in the same direction:

> Student achievement results from time spent directly and efficiently on teaching academic skills in a highly structured, teacher-controlled environment.[20]

Despite recent advocacy of less-structured, "humanistic" instruction as a means of enhancing the child's sense of self-worth, there is good evidence, Benjamin says:

> ...that the classrooms in which children feel best about themselves are not those in which "affective" programs take precedence, but those in which children are achieving the more structured and controlled environments.[21]

A quite different set of observations arises out of a grand tour of 750 "alternative schools".[22] The two educators who visited these schools are alternative-school advocates, and hence are not suspect of antagonism to this type of school. Despite the popular notion that alternative schools never require a student to do anything he doesn't want to do, these observers report that "no public alternative school that has survived more than two years gave students such a veto. Successful public alternative schools...soon learned that they needed rules about behavior, attendance, graduation requirements, respecting the rights of others, etc.",

although in alternative public schools, "students have had opportunities to help make, review, and revise many rules". However, in schools which survived two years or more, these opportunities did not include the right of students to ignore rules.

In a quite different context, that of vocational education, Lester C. Thurow underscores the point that the emphasis on cognitive skills in schooling is often misplaced.[23] He cites studies by the President's Automation Commission in the 1960s which indicated that 60% of the workers surveyed had not acquired any of the cognitive job skills they were using in formal education or training; all of their cognitive skills had been learned on the job. Even among college graduates, over 2/3 reported that they had gained cognitive skills through informal, on-the-job processes. Although he recognizes that in some fields, salable job skills can be taught in schools, Thurow advocates that the primary cognitive focus in vocational education be simply "literacy training" – training in the three Rs.

An important second role for vocational education is an area he calls "industrial discipline", the teaching of good work habits. During the height of the war on poverty, it was a common observation of those employers who were making a good-faith effort to train disadvantaged workers that it was easy to teach cognitive job skills (how to run the machine), but next to impossible to teach good work habits (show up on time, do not cuss the boss, work hard, etc.). Teaching good work habits on the job is also very expensive, Thurow adds.

Also relevant is the finding of the National Assessment on Educational Progress that as reading scores have improved somewhat, the ability of high school and junior high school students to draw inferences and to apply knowledge to problem-solving has declined.[24] There are no compelling data – in fact few data of any kind – to explain why this decline took place. Among the sixteen possible causes nominated are excessive TV viewing, and a focus on "basics" at the cost of more advanced skills.

My hypothesis is that this development also shows lack of intellectual self-discipline. Interpretation and application, much more than basic reading skills, require following certain rules (e.g., check out all main options, avoid premature closure), and a measure of patience (i.e., control of impulse). The National Assessment of Educational Progress findings suggest to me that these attributes declined. This is not to deny the possible role of other factors; for example, under most circumstances, extensive television watching develops neither self-discipline nor the ability to think.

D. Statistical Data

The recently published study, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared*, by James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, compares the educational performance of public, Catholic, and other private schools as measured by student test scores on reading, vocabulary, mathematics, and other academic skills or subjects. The 58,728 students in 1,016 public and private schools across the United States were tested in the spring of 1980.

Coleman and his colleagues compared public, Catholic, and other private schools in terms of student composition, resources, school functioning, and educational outcomes. To illuminate some questions about the effectiveness of the schools, they also examined 11 private and 12 public high-performance schools, those with the highest proportion of their graduating seniors listed as National Merit Scholarship semifinalists.

Release of the draft report by Coleman and his colleagues stirred up a major controversy, which Coleman admits he helped to generate by stressing, in his interpretation of the data, the virtue of private over public schools, and elsewhere calling for granting private schools taxpayer support. Indeed, evidence from Coleman's study is that, when family background factors that predict achievement are controlled, students in both Catholic and other private schools achieve at a higher level than students in public schools.

But the controversy swirling around private versus public, in relation to specific proposals such as tuition tax credits, has tended to obscure the more important finding: *that effective schools, whatever their ownership, had a structure that enables them, first, to main-*

tain discipline, and second, to uphold academic standards. Schools that accomplished these two goals graduated students with significantly higher knowledge and skills than those that did not. Teachers College professor Diane Ravitch sums it up:

> What the study contains is rather stunning documentation of the practices that are found in good schools, *whether they are public or private*. What it does show is that good schools have an orderly climate, disciplinary policies that students and administrators believe to be fair and effective, high enrollment in academic courses, regular assignment of homework, and lower incidence of student absenteeism, class-cutting, and other misbehavior.[26]

This relationship stands out in the analysis of all the schools in the study, and it is confirmed by the findings in the high-performance schools.

1. The Importance of Disciplinary Structure

The single most important difference between more effective and less effective schools was the disciplinary structure. While Coleman relied on such measures as enforcement of a dress code, and strictness in dealing with those who cut classes, were absent, or attacked teachers, he also drew on student assessments of the fairness of discipline. In the schools with higher levels of achievement, discipline was not merely imposed, but by and large was accepted as legitimate – that is, the majority of the students perceived discipline not as a set of arbitrary dictates, but as worthy of their commitment. In these schools, the majority of the students found the discipline effective and fair. They believed teachers' interest in them was relatively high, and they did a significantly larger amount of homework than students in the other schools (which both affected their achievements and reflected the effectiveness of the disciplinary structure). Perhaps most revealing, they had a high degree of self-esteem.

The reason Coleman's analysis comes out favoring private schools is that Catholic and other private schools are commonly more able to maintain these structural prerequisites of learning; when the same features are available in public schools, however, they work there too. As Coleman himself has acknowledged: "Good public schools do just as well as those in the private sector".[27] That is, the critical factor in school structure is not the mode of ownership. Private schools without the appropriate structure will not educate or teach well, and public schools which do command it will tend to be "high performers", all other things being equal. Statistically, private schools more often command the needed structure, but public schools can and do develop it; they are not congenitally unable to do so.

An aside is called for: At first reading, it may seem that Coleman's findings combine the psychic agenda with the cognitive one, since they stress both discipline and upholding academic standards. However, the second most important factor determining effectiveness, after disciplinary structure, is also a more structural item rather than a cognitive one. This is the proper authority relationship between teacher and student, the ability to compel task-relevant behavior and to have the class, peer, and parent support it, or at least not negate it.

2. Differences in Achievement

In all the areas the Coleman study tested, students in Catholic schools scored higher than students in public schools, and students in other private schools scored higher than either public or Catholic school students. The differences between private and public schools in test scores were greatest in mathematics. These differences in achievement between public and private school students remained strong, even after statistical controls were applied to correct for parental background factors (e.g., higher parental educational attainment) that would be expected to predict higher scores for some children no matter what school they attended.

Indeed, these statistical controls led Coleman and colleagues to conclude that it is the Catholic school rather than the public school that comes closest to meeting the American ideal of the "common school", which acts to promote equality of opportunity. This is because, in the study, the Catholic schools showed not only higher achievement scores, but also greater homogeneity in student achievement scores among students from different family backgrounds than did the

public schools. Even the high-performance public schools (mostly large suburban high schools), whose students' mean test scores were higher than those of the Catholic school students, showed greater variability in test scores. In other words, the Catholic schools were less likely than the high-performance public schools to produce above average students, but also less likely to produce below average ones. In the language of industrial quality control, the average Catholic high school is more reliable and more predictable in the quality of its product than the average high-performance public school, even if in individual cases the product is not as good.

The finding that private school students scored higher on achievement tests than public school students in a broad-based national survey has made this latest "Coleman Report" as controversial as its predecessor,[28] whose implications for school desegregation and Federal aid to education have been so widely discussed and debated. The study findings with regard to the superior test scores of Catholic school versus public school students have captured media attention, in part, because for many years, Catholic schools were widely reputed to be educationally inferior, and it was often assumed that parents who sent their children to these schools did so primarily so that their children would receive instruction in religious and moral values.

The Coleman Report findings may also be viewed by some journalists and other observers as evidence of a decline in the quality of public school education though, in fact, the report does not provide any historical comparative data that could provide a basis for such an assertion. The report has also sparked controversy because of its claim that Catholic schools are more egalitarian than public schools. Catholic schools are alleged to be more egalitarian. They are more likely, it is said, to generate similar results in achievement test scores in students from differing family backgrounds. Also, Catholic schools are said to have less racial segregation internally (although they also have proportionally fewer minority students). Finally, the study has also become something of a political football, because the authors and others have sought to draw from it policy implications relative to the debate concerning whether Congress should change tax policy to permit tuition tax credits for private schools.

3. What Are the Private Schools Doing Right?

It appears, in fact, that in the heat of political battle over tuition tax credits for private schools, the more significant, long-range implications of the Coleman Report have been somewhat obscured, if not ignored. The real issue for purposes of improving educational performance in schools, public and private alike, is: what are the private schools doing "right" that the public schools apparently are not?

Coleman *et. al.'s* own data make clear (see Tables 3 and 4) that the public/private distinction by itself is not sufficient to explain differential outcomes in student test scores, because there is a sub-sample of high-performance public schools that outperformed all but a similarly elite sample of high-performance private schools. Thus, the average public school sophomore scored 18.3 in mathematics as compared to 21.5 for Catholic school sophomores, and 22.3 for other private school sophomores, but the average sophomore in a high-performance public school scored 24.9. Similarly, among seniors, the average public school student scored 18.9 in mathematics versus 21.1 for Catholic school students and 22.4 for other private school students, but the average high-performance public school student scored 23.9.

Table 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SOPHOMORE TEST SCORES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: SPRING 1980

Test	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Means						
Reading (19)[a]	9.1	8.9	10.5	10.5	11.7	14.5
Vocabulary (21)	10.9	10.7	12.9	13.1	14.1	17.6
Mathematics (38)	18.6	18.3	21.5	22.3	24.9	30.2
Science (20)	10.9	10.8	11.9	12.4	13.2	15.1
Civics (10)	5.8	5.8	6.5	6.4	7.1	7.8
Writing (17)	10.3	10.1	11.9	11.5	12.8	14.7
Standard Deviations [b]						
Reading	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.9	4.1	2.8
Vocabulary	4.4	4.3	3.9	4.5	4.2	2.6
Mathematics	7.4	7.4	6.6	7.8	7.5	4.8
Science	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.5	2.4
Civics	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.4
Writing	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.4	2.0

[a] Numbers in parentheses refer to total number of test items

[b] Standard deviations shown are standard deviations of individual test scores. Standard errors for sector mean achievement may be found by multiplying the standard deviations shown by the following numbers:

Test	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Sophomores	.006	.006	.019	.044	.054	.055
Seniors	.006	.007	.020	.048	.062	.058

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 125.

According to Coleman and colleagues, the data suggest that two sets of intervening variables having to do with the way schools function on a daily basis actually explain most of the differences in achievement, among school types.

There are at least two important ways in which private schools produce higher achievement outcomes than public schools. First, given the same type of student (that is, with background standardized), private schools create higher rates of engagement in academic activities.

Table 4
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SENIOR TEST SCORES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: SPRING 1980

Test	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Means						
Reading (20)[a]	10.9	10.8	11.9	13.0	13.5	16.0
Vocabulary (27)	13.1	12.9	15.1	15.9	18.0	21.6
Mathematics (32)	19.1	18.9	21.1	22.4	23.9	28.1
Picture Number (15)	11.3	11.3	12.1	11.9	11.6	13.0
Mosaic (89)	45.3	45.2	47.3	51.0	54.2	55.3
Visual (16)	7.7	7.7	7.5	8.6	8.8	9.8
Standard Deviations [b]						
Reading	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.0	2.6
Vocabulary	5.4	5.3	5.1	6.0	5.7	3.7
Mathematics	6.3	6.3	5.6	6.1	5.7	2.7
Picture Number	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.5	2.8
Mosaic	14.6	14.6	12.6	14.7	16.0	14.5
Visual	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.3

[a] Numbers in parentheses refer to total number of test items

[b] See footnote b., table 6-1 for calculating standard errors for sector means

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 125.

School attendance is better, students do more homework, and students generally take more rigorous subjects (for instance, more advanced mathematics). The indication is that more extensive academic demands are made in the private schools, leading to more advanced courses and thus to greater achievement. This is a somewhat obvious conclusion, and the statistical evidence supports it.

Second, student behavior in a school has strong and consistent effects on student achievement. Apart from mathematics coursework for seniors, the greatest differences in achievement between private and public schools are accounted for by school-level behavior variables (that is, the incidence of fights, students threatening teachers, and so forth). The disciplinary climate of a school, such as the effectiveness and fairness of discipline and teacher interest, affect achievement at least in part through their effect on these school-level behavior variables.[29]

4. Four Factors Representing School Discipline

In seeking to interpret the meaning of the Coleman Report's findings for long-run improvement in school performance, we will analyse in depth four factors and their interrelationships: homework (the number of hours of homework students said they were normally required to do per week), the effectiveness of discipline (as perceived by students), the fairness of discipline (as perceived by students), and the level of teacher interest in students (as perceived by students).

Sociologically, these four factors represent varying dimensions of school discipline. "Effectiveness of discipline" and "teacher interest" represent external forms of school discipline. The former, (which reflects the stringency of the school in respect to breaches of

the rules and misbehavior) tends to be punitive and coercive. In behavioral terms, it therefore represents "negative" reinforcement, because students are presumably motivated to obey school authority due to fear of the consequences brought about by disobedience. In contrast, teacher interest in students (when it is high) is a positive form of discipline. Students presumably react to teacher interest by engaging in behavior that seems likely to gain teacher approval, thereby maintaining or heightening mutual involvement.

"Fairness of discipline" is an "internal" measure of school discipline, because it reflects student attitudes toward the authority of school rules and their enforcement. If the disciplinary climate is seen as fair, students have, in social psychological parlance, "internalized" authority by recognizing it as legitimate. The process of internalizing social authority is highly important, because it is only through internalization that people continue to obey rules when no one is looking or when there is no punishment likely for violating the rules.

Finally, hours of homework is a mixed external-internal form of discipline. On the one hand, teachers may assign more or less homework. On the other hand, students have a certain amount of discretion concerning how long and hard they work, hence, how much time they spend on homework per week. Moreover, students do homework on their own, so that doing homework regularly both requires and reinforces self-discipline.

In analyzing these four factors and their interrelationships, we will draw on some of the already published statistics from the Coleman study. Also, we asked Tom Hoffer, of the University of Chicago National Opinion Research Center, and one of the coauthors of the Coleman Report, to perform some additional cross-tabulation of the data. These "special runs" are identified with acknowledgments to Tom Hoffer on each of the tables that present these figures.

Extensive use will be made of the data collected for the Coleman Report in the pages that follow, much more so than of any of the other data bases that are available. The principal reasons for this are: first, that this is one of the best, most extensive bodies of data available; second, that it was made available to us for secondary analysis, which was useful in isolating factors which are relevant to my hypothesis; and third, because it allows us to study data for high-performance schools that are exactly comparable with data for average schools.

5. Teacher Interest In Students

We will examine first the level of teacher interest in students. Tables 5 and 6 display the cross-tabulations of level of teacher interest in students (poor, fair, good, excellent) by school type (public, Catholic, other private, high-performance private, and high-performance public) for sophomores and seniors, respectively.

Table 5
SOPHOMORES: TEACHER INTEREST IN STUDENTS

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	391770[1]	9219	5260	20	3391	409660
(Poor)	11.31[2]	0.27	0.15	0.00	0.10	11.83
	95.63[3]	2.25	1.28	0.00	0.83	
	12.70[4]	4.20	4.48	2.03	8.15	
1	1105197	48169	22849	50	12853	1189119
(Fair)	31.90	1.39	0.66	0.00	0.37	34.33
	92.94	4.05	1.92	0.00	1.08	
	35.83	21.94	19.48	5.16	30.91	
2	1286899	106959	49117	364	18236	1461575
(Good)	37.15	3.09	1.42	0.01	0.53	42.19
	88.05	7.32	3.36	0.02	1.25	
	41.72	48.72	41.88	37.34	43.85	
3	300881	55211	40063	541	7105	403802
(Excellent)	8.69	1.59	1.16	0.02	0.21	11.66
	74.51	13.67	9.92	0.13	1.76	
	9.75	25.15	34.16	55.47	17.09	
Total	3084747	219558	117289	976	41586	3464156
	89.03	6.34	3.39	0.03	1.20	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

Table 6
SENIORS: TEACHER INTEREST IN STUDENTS

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	327600[1]	12351	5993	17	1775	347737
(Poor)	11.23[2]	0.42	0 21	0.00	0.06	11.92
	94.21[3]	3.55	.72	0.00	0.51	
	12.71[4]	6.35	5.87	1.91	4.16	
1	896945	37066	14889	24	12259	961182
(Fair)	30.75	1.27	0.51	0.00	0.42	32.95
	93.32	3.86	1.55	0.00	1.28	
	34.81	19.07	14.59	2.70	28.72	
2	1041145	94968	39447	286	22086	1197931
(Good)	35.69	3.26	1.35	0.01	0.76	41.07
	86.91	7.93	3.29	0.02	1.84	
	40.40	48.86	38.66	31.84	51.74	
3	311138	49995	41696	570	6567	409966
(Excellent)	10.67	1.71	1.43	0.02	0.23	14.06
	75.89	12.19	10.17	0.14	1.60	
	12.07	25.72	40.87	63.54	15.39	
Total	2576828	194380	102025	897	42687	2916816
	88.34	6.66	3.50	0.03	1.46	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

Table 7 simplifies the information presented in Tables 5 and 6 to show the percentage of each school type rated good or excellent by sophomores versus seniors.

Table 7
TEACHER INTEREST IN STUDENTS RATED "GOOD" OR "EXCELLENT" BY STUDENTS

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	51%	52%
Catholic	74%	75%
Other private	76%	80%
High performance private	93%	95%
High performance public	61%	67%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Clearly, almost all the high-performance private schools scored as "good" or "excellent" in teacher interest in students. Ninety-three percent of sophomores and 95% of seniors in high-performance private schools rated them good or excellent in teacher interest. High-performance public schools scored somewhat higher on teacher interest in students than public schools in general – 10 points higher among sophomores and 15 points higher among seniors.

High-performance public schools scored lower in teacher interest, however, than Catholic and other private schools, and well below the high-performance private schools. The difference in sophomore scores between high-performance public schools and private schools in teacher interest ranged from a low of 14 points as compared to Catholic schools, to a high of 32 points as compared to the high-performance private schools. Among seniors, the difference in scores ranged from a low of eight points as compared to Catholic schools, and a high of 34 points as compared to the high-performance private schools.

Similarly, on both the "external" measure of perceived effectiveness of discipline, and the "internal" measure of perceived fairness of discipline, all the private schools were rated higher than all the public schools, including the high-performance public schools. Among the private schools, Catholic schools outscored other private schools on effectiveness of discipline among both sophomores and seniors (by 10 and 14 points respectively). There was little difference, however, between Catholic and other private schools in terms of perceived fairness of discipline (two points among sophomores, one point among seniors).

High-performance private schools were rated higher than the Catholic and especially the other private schools on effectiveness of discipline. There was only a four point difference between high-performance private and Catholic schools for both sophomores and seniors, but a 15 point difference among sophomores and a 20 point difference among seniors between the high-performance private schools and other private schools.

On perceived fairness of discipline, high-performance private schools again outscored both Catholic and other private schools, and by an even wider margin. Thus, high-performance private schools were rated 19% higher than other private schools, and 17% higher than Catholic schools by sophomores. Among seniors, high-performance private schools were rated 15 points higher than other private schools and, 16 points higher than Catholic schools.

Tables 8 and 9 show the original runs on sophomore and senior ratings of effectiveness of discipline by school type. Table 10 consolidates and simplifies the findings. Tables 11, 12, and 13 do the same for ratings on fairness of discipline.

Table 8
SOPHOMORES: EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCIPLINE

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	406301[1]	5973	7686	5	426[9]	424234
(Poor)	11.95[2]	0.18	0.23	0.00	0.13	12.48
	95.77[3]	1.41	1.81	0.00	1.01	
	13.45[4]	2.72	6.59	0.53	10.25	
1	1295335	43998	31040	175	19940	1390488
(Fair)	38.11	1.29	0.91	0.01	0.59	40.91
	93.16	3.16	2.23	0.01	1.43	
	42.89	20.04	26.62	18.15	47.90	
2	1045541	103068	55302	626	13428	1217965
(Good)	30.76	3.03	1.63	0.02	0.40	35.84
	85.84	8.46	4.54	0.05	1.10	
	34.62	46.94	47.43	64.82	32.26	
3	272822	66539	22557	159	3993	366071
(Excellent)	8.03	1.96	0.66	0.00	0.12	10.77
	74.53	18.18	6.16	0.04	1.09	
	9.03	30.30	19.35	16.49	9.59	
Total	3019999	219579	116584	966	41629	3398758
	88.86	6.46	3.43	0.03	1.22	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

About three-fifths of the high-performance private schools were rated "good" or "excellent" on *both* effectiveness *and* fairness of discipline by their students. Nearly half the students in Catholic schools rated their schools good or excellent on both effectiveness and fairness of discipline. The percentage was slightly less – a little over 2/5 – for other private schools. Almost identical percentages of high-performance and regular public school students rated their schools "good" or "excellent" on both dimensions of discipline.

Table 9

SENIORS: EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCIPLINE

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	447979[1]	12511	11332	44	6337	478203
(Poor)	15.71[2]	0.44	0.40	0.00	0.22	16.77
	93.68[3]	2.62	2.37	0.01	1.33	
	17.81[4]	6.45	11.29	4.94	15.30	
1	974962	40212	29872	148	12546	1057740
(Fair)	34.18	1.41	1.05	0.01	0.44	37.09
	92.17	3.80	2.82	0.01	1.19	
	38.76	20.74	29.75	16.56	30.29	
2	890381	93487	42775	378	19437	1046458
(Good)	31.22	3.28	1.50	0.01	0.68	36.69
	85.09	8.93	4.09	0.04	1.86	
	35.40	48.22	42.60	42.33	46.93	
3	201995	47655	16428	323	3100	269501
(Excellent)	7.08	1.67	0.58	0.01	0.11	9.45
	74.95	17.68	6.10	0.12	1.15	
	8.03	24.58	16.36	36.17	7.48	
Total	2515316	193866	100408	892	41420	2851902
	88.20	6.80	3.52	0.03	1.45	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

Twenty-seven percent of public school sophomores and 32% of seniors rated their schools "excellent" in both effectiveness and fairness of discipline. These percentages are displayed in Table 14.

The ratings of disciplinary effectiveness and fairness by students in high-performance public schools are of special interest in relation to school administrators' responses regarding various kinds of student disciplinary problems, such as student absenteeism, cutting classes, drug and alcohol use, verbal abuse of teachers, and vandalism.

Table 10
EFFECTIVENESS OF DISCIPLINE RATED "GOOD" OR "EXCELLENT" BY STUDENTS

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	44%	43%
Catholic	77%	73%
Other private	67%	59%
High performance private	81%	79%
High performance public	42%	54%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Table 11
SOPHOMORES: FAIRNESS OF DISCIPLINE

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	615123[1]	35478	25574	89	7802	684067
(Poor)	18.06[2]	1.04	0.75	0.00	0.23	20.08
	89.92[3]	5.19	3.74	0.01	1.14	
	20.32[4]	16.16	21.83	9.07	18.83	
1	1172600	68745	32480	217	16037	1290080
(Fair)	34.43	2.02	0.95	0.01	0.47	37.87
	90.89	5.33	2.52	0.02	1.24	
	38.74	31.32	27.72	22.09	38.70	
2	1053137	89605	44161	488	14659	1202050
(Good)	30.92	2.63	1.30	0.01	0.43	35.29
	87.61	7.45	3.67	0.04	1.22	
	34.79	40.82	37.69	49.62	35.37	
3	186258	25678	14960	189	2945	230031
(Excellent)	5.47	0.75	0.44	0.01	0.09	6.75
	80.97	11.16	6.50	0.08	1.28	
	6.15	11.70	12.77	19.22	7.11	
Total	302[illegible]18	219507	117176	984	41443	3406228
	88.87	6.44	3.44	0.03	1.22	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

Table 12
SENIORS: FAIRNESS OF DISCIPLINE

	Public 1	Catholic 2	Other Private 3	High Performance Private 4	High Performance Public 5	Total
0	648139	39776	21423	110	7793	717242
(Poor)	22.79	1.40	0.75	0.00	0.27	25.22
	90.37	5.55	2.99	0.02	1.09	
	25.85	20.45	21.35	12.46	19.09	
1	917462[1]	61738	31345	218	15954	1026716
(Fair)	32.26[2]	2.17	1.10	0.01	0.56	36.11
	89.36[3]	6.01	3.05	0.02	1.55	
	36.59[4]	31.74	31.24	24.60	39.07	
2	789627	72681	34364	352	15083	912106
(Good)	27.77	2.56	1.21	0.01	0.53	32.08
	86.57	7.97	3.77	0.04	1.65	
	31.50	37.37	34.25	39.76	36.94	
3	151854	20314	13205	205	2001	187580
(Excellent)	5.34	0.71	0.46	0.01	0.07	6.60
	80.95	10.83	7.04	0.11	1.07	
	6.06	10.44	13.16	23.19	4.90	
Total	2507082	194508	100338	885	40831	2843643
	88.16	6.84	3.53	0.03	1.44	100.00

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Notes: [1]Frequency
[2]Percent
[3]Row Percent
[4]Coleman Percent

Table 13
FAIRNESS OF DISCIPLINE RATED "GOOD" OR "EXCELLENT" BY STUDENTS

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	41%	38%
Catholic	52%	48%
Other private	50%	47%
High performance private	69%	63%
High performance public	42%	42%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

Table 14
PERCENT OF SCHOOLS RATED "GOOD" OR "EXCELLENT" ON BOTH EFFECTIVENESS AND FAIRNESS OF DISCIPLINE BY SCHOOL TYPE

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	27%	29%
Catholic	47%	45%
Other private	43%	40%
High performance private	60%	58%
High performance public	24%	32%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

These problems were more often cited as "serious or moderate" by administrators in high-performance public schools than by administrators in public schools generally. These results are displayed in Table 15. Note, in particular, that 23% of the administrators in high-performance public schools reported that "verbal abuse of teachers is a serious or moderate problem" as compared to 10% of the administrators in public schools generally.

Table 15
ASSESSMENTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS BY ADMINISTRATORS AND STUDENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: SPRING 1980

		Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
Item and Group [a]	U.S. Total	Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Student Absenteeism						
Administrators: percentage reporting it is a "serious or moderate problem"	47.2	56.6	15.2	13.8	58.1	0
Sophomores: percentage reporting "students often don't attend school"	42.9	46.2	8.1	16.1	28.2	2.8
Sophomore and senior behavior: absent five or more days, not ill	19.0	20.2	8.5	13.5	14.2	7.9
Cutting Classes						
Administrators: percentage reporting it is a "serious or moderate problem"	29.1	37.0	4.6	0	39.2	0
Sophomores: percentage reporting "students often cut classes"	58.4	62.4	15.9	25.9	67.0	6.5
Sophomore and senior behavior: cut classes now and then	36.8	39.0	18.4	34.3	50.7	26.7

Table 15 (Continued)

Item and Group [a]	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Verbal Abuse of Teachers						
Administrators: percentage reporting "verbal abuse is a serious or moderate problem"	8.6	9.6	4.7	5.3	22.6	0
Sophomores: percentage reporting "students often talk back to teachers"	39.8	41.6	22.8	21.7	25.7	9.2
Fighting and Disobedience						
Sophomores: percentage reporting "students often fight"	25.1	26.8	9.4	5.8	14.7	2.5
Sophomores: percentage reporting "students often don't obey"	28.7	30.2	14.6	13.0	18.8	4.6
Drug and Alcohol Use						
Administrators: percentage reporting it is a "serious or moderate problem"	42.3	48.5	26.2	18.0	61.3	60.0
Vandalism of School Property						
Administrators: percentage reporting it is a "serious or moderate problem"	21.8	24.5	13.8	11.7	27.1	20.0

[a] Responses taken from BB076, BB059E, and YB019A in student questionaire and Sb056 in school questionaire.

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), pp. 112–113.

In terms of student perceptions of effectiveness and fairness of discipline, however, students in high-performance public schools were no more likely than students in public schools generally to rate their schools "good" or "excellent" – with one exception. The exception is that 54% of seniors in high-performance public schools, versus 43% of seniors in public schools generally, rated their schools "good" or "excellent" on effectiveness of discipline.

It is interesting to observe that 47% of sophomores in public schools reported that "students often talk back to teachers", as compared to 26% of sophomores reporting such "back talk" in the high-performance public schools. Though "verbal abuse" and "back talk" may or may not be the same thing, there is a similarity in response between students and administrators in the high-performance public schools. In contrast, there is a wide difference in reported rates of verbal abuse/back talk between administrators and students in public schools generally.

What this could well mean is that the high-performance public schools do not necessarily have a higher incidence of verbal abuse/back talk, as compared to public schools, but that administrators in the high-performance public schools are more apt than their counterparts in public schools to see "back talk" as verbal abuse, and to consider it a serious or moderate disciplinary problem. It could also be that administrators in the high-performance public schools versus those in public schools generally are more aware and more willing to admit that their disciplinary measures are less than fully effective in curbing student behavior.

Sophomores in high-performance private schools rated their schools 39 points higher on effectiveness of discipline, and 27 points higher on fairness of discipline than sophomores in high-performance public schools. Seniors in high-performance private schools rated their schools 25 points higher on effectiveness of discipline, and 21% higher on fairness of discipline than seniors in high-performance public schools.

It is interesting to note, however, that it is only in the high-performance public schools that seniors gave their schools higher ratings (12 points higher) than did sophomores on effectiveness of discipline. Ratings on effectiveness of discipline were lower among seniors versus sophomores in the other school types (eight points lower on other private schools, and four points lower in Catholic schools).

E. Homework And Responsibility

The final dimension we will examine is the hours of homework required per week. Although Coleman and colleagues refer to hours of homework as a measure of students' involvement in school, it can also be considered another aspect of the schools' disciplinary climate, although, in this instance, the discipline being imposed is on work habits rather than on personal or interpersonal behavior. Homework is also an important measure of self-discipline, since students are required to do homework regularly and consistently away from the immediate supervision of teachers. It can thus be considered a mechanism that schools use, not only to increase cognitive learning, but also to inculcate habits of self-control and a capacity for deferred gratification that prepare the student for the adult working world.

1. Time Spent On Homework

Table 16 shows the average time spent on homework by sophomores and seniors in private schools in Spring 1980. Clearly, students in the high-performance private schools did more homework on average per week than students in any other type of school.

Table 16
AVERAGE TIME SPENT ON HOMEWORK BY SOPHOMORES AND SENIORS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: SPRING 1980

Time Spent on Homework Each Week*	U.S. Total Grade		Major Sectors: Public Grade		Major Sectors: Catholic Grade		Major Sectors: Other Private Grade		High-Performance Schools: Public Grade		High-Performance Schools: Private Grade	
	10	12	10	12	10	12	10	12	10	12	10	12
No homework assigned	2.3	3.6	2.4	4.0	0.0	0.6	1.7	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.0	0.0
None	4.5	4.0	4.7	4.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	3.8	2.2	2.3	0.6	1.9
Less than one hour	14.1	16.3	14.9	17.1	6.3	9.9	6.3	8.0	7.5	8.0	0.9	2.2
One to three hours	28.3	30.3	29.2	31.2	20.3	24.8	17.6	17.8	16.3	19.5	3.5	4.5
Three to five hours	24.0	21.3	24.0	21.0	24.9	25.1	22.5	22.8	23.2	22.8	12.0	6.8
Five to ten hours	20.5	18.0	19.4	17.0	32.8	27.1	29.8	27.3	36.8	27.2	35.2	29.0
More than ten hours	6.4	6.4	5.4	5.6	13.3	10.2	19.8	19.3	12.7	19.6	47.9	55.6
Average	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.5	5.6	4.9	6.0	5.8	5.6	5.7	9.1	9.5

*Responses are taken from item BH015 in modern questionare. Calculated by assigning 0.5, 2.0, 4.0, 7.5, and 12.5 to the last five categories in the table, and 0 to the first two.

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 104.

Seniors in high-performance private schools averaged a full six hours more homework per week than public school students generally, and 3.8 hours more homework per week than students in the high-performance public schools. Indeed, seniors in the high-performance public schools averaged less than one hour more homework per week than Catholic school students, and sophomores in the high-performance public schools averaged the same number of weekly hours of homework as Catholic school students. Students in "other private" schools averaged slightly more weekly homework than students in high-performance public schools.

When we examine the relationships between hours of homework per week and teacher interest in students rated "good" or "excellent", it becomes apparent as shown in Table 17, that in all schools other than regular public schools, high teacher interest in students makes itself felt in more hours of homework per week. Here, the association between teacher interest and more homework is stronger in high-performance public schools than in private schools generally, except again for the high-performance private schools.

Table 17
7–10 HOURS OF HOMEWORK IN SCHOOL RATED "EXCELLENT" IN TEACHER INTEREST BY SCHOOL TYPE

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	33%	34%
Catholic	62%	51%
Other private	65%	63%
High performance private	85%	86%
High performance public	71%	76%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

It would appear that spending more time on homework is not viewed as a means of gaining teacher approval in the regular public schools, but time spent on homework is viewed as a means of gaining teacher approval in all other types of schools, especially in the high-performance schools. In other words, one way in which the high-performance schools, public and private, differ from the lower-performance schools, public and private, is that teachers apparently have higher expectations about the amount of time students will spend working at home, and they reward hard work by showing interest and approval. Indeed, it would appear that in Catholic schools, where teachers are rated as highly interested in students, there is a strong tendency toward a "slacking off" in homework among seniors, whereas in the high-performance public schools with highly interested teachers, there is an opposite, though not nearly so strong, tendency for seniors to do more homework than sophomores.

2. Hours Of Homework And Discipline

Table 18 displays the relationships found between hours of homework and perceived effectiveness of discipline in the different types of schools. There is a strong positive association between hours of homework and perceived effectiveness of discipline in the high-performance private schools. Over 4/5 of the students in the high-performance private schools who rated their schools as "excellent" in effectiveness of discipline said they did 7-10 hours of homework weekly, but the percentage among seniors was considerably higher, 69%. This difference between sophomores and seniors in the high-performance public schools is such that perceived "excellence" in discipline is more strongly associated with hours of homework in the high-performance public schools versus the ordinary private schools (Catholic and other) – only where seniors are concerned. In the case of sophomores, ordinary private schools and high-performance public schools appear to be similar.

Table 18
7-10 HOURS OF HOMEWORK IN SCHOOL RATED "EXCELLENT" IN EFFCTIVENESS OF DISCIPLINE BY SCHOOL TYPE

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	29%	30%
Catholic	53%	43%
Other private	50%	59%
High performance private	90%	86%
High performance public	51%	69%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

In the case of perceived fairness of discipline, the pattern is reversed. That is, larger numbers of sophomores versus seniors who rate fairness of discipline in their schools as excellent report that they are required to do 7-10 hours of homework per week (77% versus 65%). Here again, fairness of discipline is, overall, more strongly associated with heavy homework assignments in the high-performance public schools than in the ordinary private schools. Once again, however, high-performance private schools show the strongest association between a student rating of "excellent" on fairness of discipline, and 7-10 hours of homework per week.

In summary, students in high-performance public schools scored their schools higher on all four disciplinary indicators than did students in regular public schools (with the sole exception of sophomore scores on effectiveness of discipline, which were virtually the same for high-performance and regular public schools).

Table 19
7-10 HOURS OF HOMEWORK IN SCHOOL RATED "EXCELLENT" IN FAIRNESS OF DISCIPLINE BY SCHOOL TYPE

	Sophomores	Seniors
Public	33%	31%
Catholic	63%	51%
Other private	59%	67%
High performance private	82%	88%
High performance public	77%	65%

Source: Special run provided for the National Chamber Foundation.

High-performance public schools scored lower than all other types of private schools on teacher interest, as well as on perceived fairness of discipline and, especially, on perceived effectiveness of discipline. Only on hours of homework did the high-performance public schools score about the same – or, in some cases, a little higher than – regular private schools. High-performance private schools outscored all other types on all four indicators of disciplinary climate, usually by a wide margin.

3. Academic Rigor And Discipline

At this point in the analysis, the reader is probably wondering what accounts for the "high-performance" of the high-performance public schools. Clearly, effectiveness and fairness of discipline are not the explanation, since high-performance and regular public schools score rather similarly – and below all private

schools – on these dimensions. Nor are teacher interest and hours of homework the reasons. Though high-performance public schools are ahead of regular public schools on these dimensions, the high-performance public schools score less well on teacher interest than regular private schools, and about the same or, at best, only marginally better, on hours of homework.

Although the high-performance private schools – whose achievement test scores are considerably higher than those of the high-performance public schools – rate higher on discipline, teacher interest, and homework, it may still seem that these factors, and the disciplinary ones in particular, have been overrated, since the high-performance public schools seem to manage so well without them.

The question that obviously needs to be answered at this point is: what do the high-performance public schools have going for them that accounts for their better performance? Tables 20 and 21 suggest the answer.

Table 20

PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS REPORTING THEY HAVE COMPLETED SELECTED ACADEMIC COURSES [a]: SPRING 1980

Course	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Geometry	56	53	84	77	87	100
Algebra 2	19	42	70	66	76	99
Trigonometry	24	22	44	42	57	70
Calculus	6	6	11	10	22	63
Chemistry	38	37	53	51	68	79
Physics	20	18	23	28	46	67
Third-year Spanish	4	3	7	8	11	11
Third-year French	3	2	6	10	8	18
Third-year German	1	1	1	2	5	2

[a] Responses taken from items EB004 C-E and EB005 in senior questionnaire.

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 92.

Table 21

PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS SELECTED ACADEMIC COURSES ARE OFFERED WHO HAVE TAKEN THESE COURSES [a]: SPRING 1980

Course	U.S. Total	Major Sectors			High-Performance Schools	
		Public	Catholic	Other Private	Public	Private
Geometry	57.3	54.4	84.5	79.0	86.1	99.8
Algebra 2	50.2	47.8	72.3	67.1	75.5	99.8
Trigonometry	28.0	25.5	48.1	46.8	52.5	94.2
Calculus	10.4	9.5	14.7	24.6	23.5	62.2
Chemistry	39.2	37.6	52.8	54.6	68.5	78.9
Physics	21.3	20.4	24.4	30.6	45.8	66.6
Third-year Spanish	5.0	4.4	7.5	16.7	11.5	17.2
Third-year French	3.8	3.1	6.4	15.9	9.5	20.8
Third-year German	2.3	2.2	1.2	7.0	5.3	4.5

[a] Responses taken from items EB004 C-E and EB005 in senior questionnaire.

Source: James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 92.

If the high-performance public schools can boast higher achievement test scores than ordinary private schools, this is very likely due to their more comprehensive and rigorous course offerings and course requirements, particularly in science and math.

Paradoxically, however, these tables point up what appears to be the way in which teacher interest and discipline, both external (effective discipline) and internal (discipline perceived as fair), serve to compensate in Catholic and other private schools for a comparatively weaker academic program. Note, for example, that Catholic and other private schools are much less likely to offer various math courses, especially advanced math (trigonometry and calculus), than the high-performance public schools. Since math courses are cumulative and must typically be taken in sequence, this must also mean that students in high-performance public schools take more math courses, as well as more demanding ones on average, than Catholic school students. In addition, the fact that higher percentages, on average, of high-performance public school students take math and science courses than Catholic school students, where such courses are offered, also suggests that the high-performance public school students are either encouraged or perhaps required to follow a more demanding academic program.

Yet, if we turn back to Tables 3 and 4, we can observe that senior test scores in mathematics are only 2.8 points higher in high-performance public schools versus Catholic schools, and 1.5 points higher than other private schools. (High-performance public school seniors outperform the regular public school seniors on the math test by 4.8 points; high-performance private school students, in turn, outscore the high-performance public school seniors by 4.2 points.) Though the evidence is indirect, the implications nevertheless seem clear. High-performance public schools produce better outcomes than regular public and private schools, because they offer a more rigorous academic program. Yet Catholic and other private schools manage to compensate, at least partially, for having weaker academic programs than the elite public schools by employing discipline (external and internal) and teacher interest to boost student achievement. High-performance private school students outscore all others on achievement tests by a wide margin, because their schools offer both academic rigor and a disciplinary climate that is effective, involving, and legitima-

ted by student perceptions of fairness.

4. Successful Characteristics And Successful Schools

Fifteen Thousand Hours[30] indicates that the same structures and school processes that are conducive to effective learning and good behavior on the part of students are also conducive to good teaching. Thus, they have a double effect on students, since many of the distinguishing characteristics of the schools that were successful with students – such as the assignment of homework, and the use of rewards – depend on individual teachers. As the authors observe, it is much easier to be a good teacher in some schools than in others. In the more successful schools, for instance, teachers enjoyed a high degree of consensus on values, and a style of supervision that, without being intrusive, reflected concern about the way the school functioned. High morale and harmonious working relationships helped to bring about teachers' skills. In contrast, in some of the less successful schools, teachers appeared very isolated, doing their own work with little apparent support or interest from others.

The data presented in Table 22 show some of the correlations Rutter *et. al.* found between various measures of teacher support versus isolation, and the rankings of the schools studied in four areas: attendance, behavior, academic achievement, and delinquency.

Table 22
CORRELATIONS OF MEASURES CONDUCIVE TO EFFECTIVE LEARNING AND GOOD TEACHING

		Correlations with Outcome			
		Att.	Beh.	Ac.	Del.
9.	Group planning of syllabus	0.66	0.14	0.35	0.78
43.	Pattern of decision making	0.37	0.64	0.57	0.45
44.	Representation of views	0.36	0.09	0.51	0.28
45.	Other-staff aware of teacher lateness	0.53	-0.03	-0.01	0.32
46.	Adequate clerical help	0.27	0.61	0.19	0.47
3.	Checks on homework setting	0.49	0.16	0.52	0.50

Table 7.9 Staff organization and outcome
Source: Michael Rutter, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimer, Janet Ouston, with Alan Smith, *Fifteen Thousand Hours – Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 135.

For example, the practice of checking on the teachers' assignment of homework shows a moderately strong correlation (0.52) with academic achievement. Schools in which teachers reported receiving adequate clerical help had a moderately strong correlation (0.61) with a positive student behavior ranking. All of the measures of teacher support versus isolation showed significant correlations with at least two of the outcome dimensions.

For both teaching and learning, the cumulative effect of all the various social factors appeared to be greater than that of any single factor. Together, these characteristics of the school created an ethos – a set of values, attitudes, and behaviors characteristic of the school as a whole – that had a pervasive effect on children and teachers alike. The authors combined in a single scale 39 process measures that were significantly associated with one or more of the outcomes. This more global school process measure was strongly and consistently correlated with each of the measures of outcome.[31] The authors speculate that the importance of the separate school process measures may lie in their contribution to this ethos.[32]

The schools' rankings with regard to student behavior showed a very high correlation (0.92) with the global school process measure. The correlation with aca-

demic achievement was also strong (0.76), though somewhat lower than for behavior. Attendance and delinquency showed moderately strong correlations of 0.65 and 0.68 respectively.[33] The authors point out that if the correlations of each of the separate process measures were chance or unrelated phenomena, adding them together would tend to cancel out any random correlations. The fact that the correlations are strengthened by combining the separate scores indicates that these are effects which are cumulative and which reinforce one another.[34]

Similarly, Robert Benjamin focused on ethos, or school climate, as the key to the success of one of the "maverick schools" he studied. He comments that this web of human interactions is harder to identify, and much harder to change, than isolated factors.[35]

5. The Importance Of Homework

The role of homework is pivotal. First, not because it provides more hours to pump information into pupils, but because it both encourages and measures the development of self-discipline and associated good working habits. Homework is typically done not under close supervision of teachers or parents, but by pupils, "on their own", to be evaluated later. Hence, when systematically and fairly evaluated, it fosters the crucial *internalization* of discipline, the foundation of self-discipline.

Michael Rutter *et. al.* list homework as the factor most strongly associated with good school outcomes. Schools which require more homework had *both* better-behaving pupils *and* higher scholastic achievements. Homework in American schools is low, with more than 70% of the *high* schools requiring less than five hours per week. Among the possible explanations for the high correlations between assignments of homework, and academic success and good student behavior, Rutter and colleagues point to the possible effects on character formation:

> ...it may well be that in addition to its practical value in providing opportunities for the consolidation of the learning of work introduced in the school time, homework may also be of symbolic importance in emphasizing the school's concern for academic progress, and its expectation that pupils have *the ability and self-discipline needed to work without direct supervision*.[3]

Another important way to promote self-discipline, second only to homework, is to involve pupils, especially in high schools, in the setting and enforcement of behavior rules. Rutter *et. al.* report that schools in which "a high proportion of children held some kind of position of responsibility in the school system had better outcomes with respect to both pupil behavior and examination success".[37]

6. Other Factors

Of course, there are other factors which affect teaching. Communities uninterested in or hostile to learning, lacking in successful role models (or rich in the wrong ones, such as "making it" by circumventing school and being a numbers runner, drug peddler, etc.), or ravaged by unemployment, crowded housing, garbage and rats dampening learning. Teachers who are underpaid, and who do not feel respected, will not be paragons of education. Extensive TV exposure seems to be a negative factor. And there are some pupils – in all classes and races – who do have low I.Q.s or severe learning disabilities. However, so far as the effective working of schools is concerned – holding constant, so to speak, their environment and the cognitive abilities of the pupils – school structure is, in my view, the prime factor. Cognitive deficiencies are secondary and often reflect, in part, the other factors. True, the circle closes: once cognitive deficiencies accumulate, they tend to pose personality problems, as evident in learning-disabled pupils who become disruptive. But the main vector points the other way: studies of effective schools suggest that even children with cognitive problems learn they can mobilize and commit.

IV. SELF-DISCIPLINE AND DISCIPLINE

While the common preoccupation with the cognitive agenda focuses on consequences rather than on the prime cause, a parallel concern with discipline is much closer to the mark. In one public opinion survey after another, teachers and parents rank discipline as the number one problem of the schools. Their attention to discipline is highly relevant: it focuses on the school as a structure in which learning is to take place, and suggests that in a classroom where the proper relationships between pupils and teachers, and between students and rules and routines, cannot be developed and maintained, learning is not possible. Violent schools, the public correctly perceives, are not only unsafe, but also provide institutional conditions under which schools cannot discharge their teaching duties.

A. Self-Discipline And Structure

Unfortunately, the focus of discipline itself is partially misdirected, although at least it calls attention to the right issue, the psychic one. Discipline, as most people understand it, is highly external: teachers and principals "lay down the law", will not brook any talking back; students "behave themselves" to teachers, don't damage property, do what they're told, don't disrupt class. What the pupil, the future adult, really needs is *self*-discipline, the ability to mobilize and commit self. This, in turn, is developed in structured conditions, but not in authoritarian ones.

Kenneth D. Benne[38] puts this distinction in terms of non-authoritarian versus authoritarian forms of authority. Authority is necessary to all stable community life, he argues, but authoritarianism overemphasizes the demands of the bearer of authority and the one-way dependence of the subject. It is just as undesirable in a democratic society as anarchy, which overemphasizes the subject's right to autonomous action. The non-authoritarian authority relations Benne advocates emphasize the "active and responsible interdependence" of the bearer and the subject – the teacher and the student, in the case of schools.

In schools as Benne sees them, authority at its best operates to help immature persons internalize the habits and values of the community and thus grow into responsible, self-directing participants in it.[39] Authoritarianism is inconsistent with this goal.

> It is not primarily through external rules, commands, threats, or punishments of pupils that the authority of the teacher functions. The teacher does not establish his "authority" and then proceed about the non-authoritative tasks of instruction and counseling. Rather, his authority functions in every act and decision by which he influences and shapes the spirit, the atmosphere, the direction, the form, and the content of the inclusive process of common life in the school...The whole common active experience of the school educates.[40]

Discipline and self-discipline are not often matters which are subjects of empirical research. However, those studies which exist point both to the importance of discipline *and* to the need not to see it as co-equal to punishment.

David Reynolds *et. al.* found that enforcement of uniforms, a "perfect system" (pupils involved in shaping and administering the rules), and a *low* level of corporal punishment were significantly correlated with good attendance.[41] K. H. Heal found that misbehavior is worse in schools which emphasize punishment.[42] A. Clegg and B. Megson found highest delinquency rates in schools with the highest degree of corporal punishment.[43]

The line between structure and authoritarianism is easy to illustrate but not to define with great precision. Basically, what is needed is not close, continuous external supervision, but a school structure – authority figures, rules, and organization of tasks – that will build up the capacity of the student to regulate self. This is achieved best, it seems, when what is required of the students is clearly and fully explained, rather than arbitrarily announced, changed at will and whim, and aimed as much at teachers' egos as at educational enhancement. Advancing self-organization requires that assignments be "doable", appropriately checked,

and rewarded. When they are excessive and mechanical (such as excessive memorizing), or when rewards are allocated by irrelevant criteria (such as being teacher's favorite, or having influential parents or minority status), requirements become dictates, coercive and unsatisfying, not sources of involvement and ways to build commitments.

How quickly these matters can be confused is apparent in the following statement by James O'Toole:

> Because of the American school system's commitment to mobility and equality, there is now a shortage of working class people, individuals socialized for an environment of bureaucratic and hierarchical control and of strict discipline. Employers are correct in their observations that the schools are failing to provide enough men and women who are passive and compliant, who seek only extrinsic rewards for their labors, and who have the stamina and stoicism to cope with the work technologies and processes developed during the industrial revolution."

Strict discipline and hierarchical structure will tend to produce passive, compliant workers, at best suited for some crude jobs. Most work, especially in a high-technology society, requires people who are more actively involved in their work, care about the outcomes, show a measure of initiative and creativity – all the hallmarks of the self-disciplined and committed person, not the industrial cog.

V. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

The first step toward reconstruction of the schools from the inside will require a higher level of awareness and analysis of the school as a set of experiences, as a system of rewards and punishment, as a structure. Some educators refer to the merits of "learning by experience" rather than by lecture, evoking the work of Dewey or Montessori, for example. This is quite a different matter. They refer, by and large, to teaching methods which enhance cognitive learning. A child is said to learn more about Egyptian pyramids, for example, by building a small one out of toy bricks than by a teacher-talk, even if it is backed up with visual aids. The educational experiences I refer to are, as a rule, imparted by life in school, and they affect, most immediately, personality development, not task-oriented learning.

A. The Importance Of School Experiences

The significant effect of experience has been widely recognized in one area. Sports have often been held up as the arena in which character is formed. In sports – and other "extra"-curricular activities – the noncognitive dimension is obvious. Hence, the opportunity sports provide for education (as distinct from teaching) has been recognized since the ancient Greeks. My point is that *all* school activities are like sports in two pivotal ways: first, the experiences generated – not by what teachers say, but by the way they conduct themselves, deal with students, with each other, with assignments, and so on – affect pupils' character. Second, like sports, these experiences are often counterproductive in many, maybe as many as 1/3 of America's schools.

In about 15-20% of the schools, especially public schools or schools in large cities, the dominant issue is custodial maintenance (i.e., coping with violent or disruptive students). In many other schools, especially suburban or private schools, a variety of psychological approaches hinder education. Since most educators, parents, and citizens seem to think about schools in terms of academic achievements, content of teaching, and teaching styles – or to think about personality-shaping experiences as a matter reserved for extracurricular activities, not the whole school – the first step to correction must occur through a change in awareness of how schools affect personality development, the direction of their current effect, and how it might be redirected.

An unusual experiment with classes of slow learners in several secondary schools in British Columbia, Canada, highlights the possibility of educational reforms which have a positive effect on self-discipline and character formation. One of the attributes often ascribed to slow learners is low self-esteem, the belief that, "I can't do it, so why bother trying". This attitude is the opposite of the self-disciplined person who is able to forge ahead when encountering difficulties, even if there is no guarantee of success.

Often, the approach with slow learners is to set up special classes with a back to basics approach – only reinforcing the children's sense that they are "dumb". This study chose an entirely different route. It "was purposely planned to provide the students with challenging and relatively sophisticated learning experiences as part of their examination of a contemporary social problem", which would "challenge greatly the intellectual and social and social abilities".[45]

The issue selected was lack of adequate housing, long a concern in British Columbia. Students were asked to consider the following questions:

> Does a housing problem exist in your community? What factors affect the cost of housing? What should be done about the housing problem? What are appropriate methods for taking social action in a democratic society?[46]

Materials used by the students included current newspapers and magazines, government reports, etc. The children were encouraged to ask questions about the difficult material and to discuss the issues outside the classroom.[47]

The results were marked improvements in the sense of self-esteem among the students involved in the challenging program; over the same period, children in a

control group using a traditional teaching format showed a small decline. Using the Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI), a widely-used psychological testing method, all students are rated on a scale of 100 both before and after the period of instruction. The experimental group rose in self-esteem from 57.2 to 62.5, whereas the control group declined from 58.9 to 56.1. A separate group, for which there was no control counterpart, showed an 8.2 point increase, from 52.7 to 60.9.[48] The results "supported the hypothesis that involving students in the challenging study of a relevant, interesting problem, with possibilities of positive feedback from community people and from parents, would have a positive effect on self-esteem".[49]

While further study of this issue is needed, it would seem that encouraging the students, despite the fact that they had been classified as slow learners, to voice their opinions, to apply themselves to material that is difficult, to care about social problems and to ask questions, has a positive effect on their own view of their capacity to learn. Teaching methods of this type, even if limited to part of the school day, could encourage students to apply themselves to their other schoolwork with more diligence.

To say that new attention to school as a set of experiences is the first step toward reconstruction is clearly a matter of emphasis. It does not mean that I attach no importance to the other problems that beset our schools – violence, teacher burnout, over-regulation, shortcomings in imparting basic knowledge and skills. Indeed, all these factors are interrelated; burned-out teachers no more encourage constructive experiences than they encourage cognitive learning. Nonetheless, I focus on the way the experiences of schooling shape personality, because I believe this matter is crucial in restoring the effectiveness of the schools, and it has been too long neglected.

B. Classroom Environment And Character Traits

Self-discipline and related character traits are difficult to quantify, and hence more difficult to measure. Even harder to measure, perhaps, is the classroom "environment" that is needed to produce these traits. One large-scale study by Jane A. Stallings attempted to evaluate programs whose purpose was precisely to encourage the development of "such attributes as task persistence, attending ability, cooperation, inquiry behavior, and independence".[50] While admitting that such attributes are "elusive", she was "able to operationally define and systematically observe some of these behaviors".[51]

The study covered 105 first grade classrooms, and 58 third grade classrooms, that were part of the government-sponsored Follow Through Planned Variations programs. Follow Through projects were implemented in 136 urban and rural communities in all regions of the country to test the impact of various types of educational theories.[52]

The numerous educational procedures that had been implemented in the 105 first grade classrooms were first evaluated to determine their impact on the following character traits: independence (defined as the ability of a child or children to work at a task without direct adult supervision), task persistence (defined as a child's ability to engage in self-instruction without losing interest), and cooperation (defined as the ability of a child to work with his classmates on group tasks). They were also correlated with the following behavioral indicators: self-esteem, frequency of asking questions, and verbal initiative. The correlations were then adjusted to take account of entering ability of the students as measured by the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT). The classroom procedures were, in each case, far more responsible for the observed differences in behavioral outcomes than entering ability.[53]

The children's academic progress was then measured by Metropolitan Achievement Tests in reading and in mathematics. Stepwise regression analysis was used to determine how much of the observed variance in test scores was attributable to entering ability, and how much to classroom processes. "Observed classroom procedures", Stallings concludes, "contributed as much to the explanation of test score differences as did the initial ability of the children".[54] In reading scores among first graders, initial ability accounted for approximately 50% of the observed variance, the classroom processes about 23%. (The remainder was not accounted for by either factor under study here.) By the third grade, they were nearly equally responsible for the variance, and together accounted for nearly 80% of the variance observed.

In mathematics, the classroom procedures were found to be even more important. While entering ability was clearly a significant factor, accounting for more than 30% of the observed variance, the classroom processes accounted for more than 40%. By the third grade, the classroom processes were found to be three times more significant than the students' entering ability. These results are summarized in Table 23.

Other significant results revealed in the table are that classroom processes account for nearly 50% of the observed variances in absentee rates, "suggesting that what occurs in classrooms is related to whether or not the child stays away from school".[55] Third graders were also tested using Raven's test of non-verbal reasoning. Despite the fact that the ability to function well on this test was not thought to be dependent on environmental factors, the classroom processes were almost as explanatory as initial intelligence. Classroom procedures were also found to be highly explanatory of the children's willingness (or lack thereof) to take responsibility for their successes and failures, as measured by the Intellectual Responsibility Scale (IRA).

The specific educational activities that affected each of the behavioral outcomes are themselves interesting. Independence was fostered "in classrooms where teachers allow children to select their own seating and groups part of the time, where a wide variety of activities are available, and where an assortment of audiovisual and exploratory materials are available".[56] Among factors affecting task persistence was the use of workbooks, especially in a setting where "children can have a question answered or directions clarified and then persist in the task at hand".[57] Much more work needs to be done to isolate factors such as these that can aid in character formation, but one thing is clear: the types of teaching processes used and their interaction with the developing character of the child have a substantial effect on "achievement in basic skills, good attendance, and desired child behaviors".[58]

Table 23
SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSES

	First grade (N=105)				Third grade (N=58)			
Outcome Variable	Initial ability WRAT	WRAT Process variables	Process variables (unique)	Number of process variables (incl. in regression)*	Initial ability WRAT	WRAT process variables	Process variables (unique)	Number of process variables (incl. in regression)*
Behavioral Outcome Variables								
Child questions	.00	.28	.28	2	.00	.29	.29	3
Self-esteem	.00	.48	.48	5	.01	.42	.41	6
Child independence	.00	.67	.67	5	.01	.41	.40	3
Task persistence	.00	.44	.44	9	.06	.61	.55	6
Cooperation	.00	.32	.32	2	.10	.61	.51	5
Verbal initiative	.00	.22	.22	3	.00	.38	.38	2
Days absent	.01	.67	.66	14	.07	.69	.62	6
Test Outcome Variables								
MAT math	.32	.74	.42	10	.17	.81	.64	8
MAT reading	.50	.73	.23	8	.42	.79	.37	7
Raven's	–	–	–	–	.41	.86	.45	9
IAR–success	–	–	–	–	.18	.57	.39	4
IAR–failure	–	–	–	–	04	.83	.79	11

* These columns contain the number of process variables that entered the stepwise regression with an "F-to-enter"that was significant at .05.

Source: "What Teachers Do Does Make a Difference," in Arthur J. Newman, ed., *In Defense of the American Public School* (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1978), p. 206.

Britain's Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, under the direction of Elliot Jaques, developed for industrial management a strategy for enhanced self-awareness and change which might well be applied to schools.[39] In their strategy, they do not attempt to introduce changes either from the outside (on the basis of directives, expert advice, etc.) or by meeting with some of the staff (say, the foreman). Instead, self-analysis and change are "dialogued" from the top down. The process starts with sessions with top management and works its way down the corporate hierarchy. This approach greatly increases the probability that the higher levels will support rather than hinder change, and that all levels will be involved and won over. Group therapists or other facilitators may participate, but to enhance the process, not to dominate it.

In schools, this approach entails working first with school boards and groups of superintendents, then principals, then teachers, then PTA, and students. A good way to start might be to determine what experiences the school now generates, and ask what they ought to be from the viewpoint of the desired educational outcomes. The next step would be to ask how the desired changes can be achieved. Outside facilitators might be required to prevent self-analysis from turning into defensive self-justification or mere gripe sessions.

C. External Factors

At the same time as schools heighten their awareness of character development, factors external to the schools will have to be tackled. The schools have been overloaded with assignments, from making up for the preschool education millions of families do not complete, to scores of educational goals promoted by various interest groups, from sex education to religious teaching, from foreign languages to "non-competency-based" promotion. According to education writer Gene I. Maeroff, the chief problem with the public schools is that adults have burdened them with too many good intentions – for which the kids pay the price.[60] The question is not the merit of these assignments; when each is viewed in isolation from the others, many may be of merit. But if one looks at the schools' ability to carry out all of them, or even a fair share, they overload the schools to the point that many have stopped trying to be effective and just "cope".

Correctives might come from several directions. The schools' load could be eased if families do more of their educational duty before their youngsters reach school. In addition, it would be helpful for families to work more closely with schools, and especially for the schools to make greater efforts to involve parents in their work, rather than either shut them out or manipulate them in PTAs and other such groups.

D. Strengthening Curricula

One important step to reconstructing schools would be to reverse the trend toward watering down curricula. The importance of this is two-fold: a more stringent curriculum imparts more of the knowledge and skills students need to go on to college or to succeed in the business world, and more difficult curricula require more effort from the students, larger homework assignments, more opportunities for the student to learn to apply her or himself to rigorous analytical reasoning. As the National Commission on Excellence in Education concluded in its report to the President:

> "Secondary-school curricula have been homogenized, diluted, and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose. In effect, we have a cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses."[61]

Clifford Adelman, of the National Institute of Education, points out that the number of students taking less demanding courses has increased dramatically in the last few decades. Graduating seniors taking drivers' education, for example, increased from 1% in the '60s to 59% by the late '70s. More significant was the decrease in the number of students enrolled in the "academic track" from 48 to 36% , and an increase in enrollment in the general track, from 12 to 42%, of which Adelman says:

> "It's the wasteland of the American high school. It's a confused conglomeration of courses. They're watered down – a lot of personal service and remedial stuff."[62]

These trends led the National Commission on Excellence in Education to make curriculum reform one of its primary recommendations. This recommendation has many virtues, not the least of which is the greater amount of effort that would be required from students to handle a more demanding course slate, both in terms of classroom effort and homework.

E. Promoting Self-Discipline: Other Measures

Our analysis of the Coleman data pointed out the importance of homework in teaching and reinforcing self-discipline. *Fifteen Thousand Hours*, as discussed earlier, also found homework to be pivotal. And yet, despite the apparent importance of homework, both from the point of view of academic achievement and of character formation, it does not seem to be a high priority among public school administrators. Only seven percent of the school districts surveyed by the National Center for Education Statistics said that increasing the amount of homework was a high priority. Forty-six percent said that it was a low priority, and 47% said it was of medium importance. Measures they favored were efforts to increase daily attendance, considered a high priority by 66% of the school districts surveyed, and increasing the number of credits required in "core" subject areas, considered a high priority by 47% of the school districts.

The measure most favored which has some bearing on the issue of self-discipline is establishing or increasing courses to improve the students' study skills and habits.

This was also considered a high priority by 47% of the school districts. The findings for these and other suggested educational reforms are summarized in Table 24. The Table also shows how many school districts have actually taken measures to implement these reforms, or plan to by 1984-85.[63]

Another corrective would be for the general public to raise its public involvement somewhat, to countervail single-issue and other interest groups. More broadly-based public pressure would make it easier for the schools to avoid the costly and ultimately counterproductive programs to which they have been pushed, for example, by the most extreme advocates of bilingual education, who want almost everything taught in a child's own language, and not merely for a transition period.

Table 24
IMPORTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES FOR IMPROVING HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT BY REGION: FALL 1982

Activities to improve Academic Achievement	Degree of importance to District Policy				Implemented Between 1979-80 and 1980-81	Planned by 1984-85
	Total	High	Medium	Low		
		Percentage Distribution of School Districts			Percent of School Districts	
Increase daily attendance	100	66	23	11	69	51
Increase units of credit required in core subject areas	100	47	30	23	53	38
Establish/increase courses to improve students' study skills habits	100	47	41	12	48	52
Establish/increase minimum competency requirements for graduation	100	29	37	34	27	34
Establish/increase requirements for in-service teacher training for subject matter competence	100	28	47	26	36	43
Establish/increase minimum competency tests for teachers	100	9	21	70	9	12
Increase amount of homework	100	7	47	46	19	19
Extend the school day or the school year	100	5	15	80	7	8

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Fast Response Survey System, Survey of School Districts in Academic Requirements and Achievement, unpublished tabulations (November 1982).

As a result of greater mobilization of the public, interest groups would have to moderate their demands on schools, if only because they would be made to recognize that unless the schools are allowed to attend more actively to their first business, nobody's goal will be served. They might also be more inclined to work *with* the schools to find mutually satisfactory ways of meeting legitimate needs. Thus, the American Civil Liberties Union, to protect students' civil rights, has insisted that schools meticulously observe due process in suspending students. As Roland S. Barth, of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, put it, as of early 1980, "the courts have established that students are now entitled to virtually the same due process rights as an accused felon".[64] He then cites 40 lines of tight text which describe the procedure. The result has been procedures that are so cumbersome and time-consuming that, in practice, the most disruptive students stay in school. The urgent need is to work out procedures that make it easier to remove from public schools truly disruptive students, without opening the door to wanton violation of their civil rights.

F. Removing Burdensome Regulations

Some deregulation and reduction of the role of state and federal agencies would also help. In the matter of suspending students, for example, procedures prescribed by state and federal agencies push schools in the same direction as the safeguards urged by the A.C.L.U. – toward protecting the rights of a disruptive student at the expense of the need of all students for the school to sustain an educational environment.

Reducing state and federal intervention would also serve to reduce the mountain of paperwork which now takes time and energy away from the schools' primary task. In the state of Maryland, for example, in order for the principal to take one student out of a regular class, and for that period assign him or her to a resource teacher for school-paid tutoring to help the child catch up, parental consent in writing is required. This, in turn, requires a meeting with the school's "educational team", the filing of a written report, and several other bureaucratic steps.

The burdensome effects of over-regulation come out clearly in a study by Michael Kirst, a professor of education at Stanford University and president of the California State Board of Education. He found that over a 10 year period covering the mid- and late '70s – a time of increasing governmental regulation – the number of "central office administrators" rose three times faster than the number of teachers, 13% and 4% respectively. Student enrollment, however, dropped 9% over the same period. He also found that the strings attached to federal aid ended up making federal aid nine times more costly to administer than local appropriations.[65]

Secretary of Education T. H. Bell reported that, by eliminating 30 sets of "cumbersome, burdensome, and unnecessary regulations", the equivalent of 118 printed pages in the Federal Register, he reduced the size of a year's grant applications by 200,000 pages, dropped 7,000 pages out of financial reports, and 20,000 pages out of programmatic reports.[66] Nobody claims that the state of deregulated bliss may not be exaggerated by a few pages, but nobody doubts that a keen search would find more regulations and forms which could be cut with little harm and much relief.

VI. IN CONCLUSION

Without trying to summarize the details of the evidence and discussion, the main point which stands out is that the whole schooling process should be viewed as *extra-curricular* activity, as especially sports are – their effect on character, in particular on self-discipline. Schools do not merely teach; they should educate. If they do not educate, they cannot teach. About half of the pupils come to school psychically underdeveloped. Unless the school helps to develop their personalities, they will not mature, will not be able to function as responsible employees or citizens, and will not be able to learn in school.

Does that mean adding to the schools one more mission, which one's parents should be discharging? Yes and no. Yes, in the sense that as long as parents do not form the character of their children, schools must – or they will not be able to function effectively. No, in the sense that one must not *add* missions to overloaded schools, without reducing some other duties.

How the business community and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States can help this process is a subject to be explored collaboratively.

FOOTNOTES

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *National Institute of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress*.

2. James F. Henry and Susan Ueber Raymond, *Basis Skills in the U.S. Work Force, The Contrasting Perceptions of Business, Labor, and Public Education* (New York: Center for Public Resources, 1982), p. 16.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

4. *Ibid.*, Annex X.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

7. Madeleine B. Hemmings, Memorandum: "Making American Schools Work Again", U.S. Chamber of Commerce, December 14, 1981.

8. "Education is Industry's Business", *Business Week* (editorial), July 11, 1983, p. 106.

9. Alan H. Magazine, Director, *America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response* (Washington, D.C.: Business-Higher Education Forum), 1983.

10. The National Center for Educational Statistics, *The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 52.

11. Sheila Tobias, *Overcoming Math Anxiety* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978), p. 74.

12. Christopher Jencks, *Who Gets Ahead? The Determinants of Economic Success* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

13. Charles E. Silberman, *Crises in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 9.

14. *Ibid.*

15. George E. and Caroline O. Vaillant, "Natural History of Male Psychological Health, X: Work as a Predictor of Positive Mental Health", *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 138 (1981), pp. 1433-40.

16. Robert Benjamin, *Making Schools Work: A Reporter's Journey Through Some of America's Most Remarkable Classrooms* (New York: Continuum, 1981).

17. *Ibid.*, p. 190.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 190.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 191.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 192.

22. Joe Nathan and Herbert Kohl, "Public Alternative Schools and the Future of Democracy", *Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 1981, p. 733.

23. Lester C. Thurow, "Vocational Education as a Strategy for Eliminating Poverty", in *The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study*, Vocational Education Study Publication No. 1, National Institute of Education, April 1979, p. 327.

24. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress, *Three National Assessments of Reading: Changes in Performance, 1970-1980*, summary no. 11-R-35.

25. James S. Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

26. Diane Ravitch, "What Makes a Good School?" *Society*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (January/February 1982), p. 10.

27. Edward B. Fiske, "School Study Said to Fail to Emphasize Main Point", *New York Times*, April 26, 1981.

28. James S. Coleman and others, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Office Of Education, 1966).

29. James S. Coleman, *et. al.*, 1982, p. 178.

30. Michael Rutter, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore, Janet Ouston, with Alan Smith, *Fifteen Thousand Hours – Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979).

31. *Ibid.*, pp. 141-44.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 179.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 142-43.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 141.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 110 (emphasis added).

37. *Ibid.*, p. 197.

38. Kenneth D. Benne, *A Conception of Authority* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1934; reissued 1971), pp. 27, 89, 161.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 153-54.

40. *Ibid.*, pp. 183-84.

41. David Reynolds, D. Jones, and S. St. Leger, "Schools Do Make a Difference", *New Society*, Vol. 37, p. 321.

42. K. H. Heal, "Misbehavior Among School Children: The Role of the School in Strategies for Prevention", *Policy and Politics*, Vol. 6, (1978), pp. 321-32.

43. A. Clegg and B. Megson, *Children in Distress* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1968).

44. James O'Toole, *Work, Learning, and the American Future* (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1977), pp. 117-18.

45. Charles K. Curtis and James J. Shaver, "Improving Slow Learners' Self-Esteem in Secondary Social Studies Classes", *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 74 (1981), p. 219.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 218.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 219.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 221.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 220.

50. Jane A. Stallings, "What Teachers Do Does Make a Difference", in Arthur J. Newman, ed., *In Defense of the American Public School* (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1978), p. 199.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 199.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 193.

53. *Ibid.*, pp. 199-205.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 205.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 207.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 199.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 200-201.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

63. *The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1983), p. 68.

64. Roland S. Barth, "Discipline: If You Do That Again. . . .", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 61 (February 1980), p. 398.

65. David G. Savage, "The Federal Schoolhouse", *The New Republic*, April 18, 1981, p. 21.

66. T. H. Bell, *U.S. Department of Education News*, August 21, 1981, p. 1.

59. Elliot Jaques, *The Changing Culture of a Factory* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1951).

60. Gene I. Maeroff, *Don't Blame the Kids: The Trouble with America's Public Schools* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981).

61. "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform", reprinted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 4, 1983, p. 12.

62. As quoted in Robert J. Samuelson, "Schooling and Education", *National Journal*, April 9, 1983, p. 754.

REFERENCES

Barth, Roland S. "Discipline: If You Do That Again, _____", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 61. (February 1980).

Bell, T. H. *U.S. Department of Education News, August 21, 1981.*

Benjamin, Robert. Making Schools Work: A Reporter's Journey Through Some of America's Most Remarkable Classrooms (New York: Continuum, 1981).

Benne, Kenneth D. *A Conception of Authority* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1944, reissued 1971).

Business-Higher Education Forum, Alan H. Magazine, Director. *America's Competitive Challenge: the Need for a National Response, A Report to the President of the United States from the Business-Higher Education Forum* (Washington, D.C.: Business-Higher Education Forum, 1983.

Business Week (editorial). "Education is Industry's Business", *Business Week*, July 11, 1983, p. 106.

Center for Public Resources, James F. Henry, President, Susan Ueber Raymond, Vice President, Study Director. *Basic Skills in the U.S. Work Force, The Contrasting Perceptions of Business, Labor, and Public Education* (New York: Center for Public Resources, 1982).

Clegg, A., and B. Megson. *Children in Distress*. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1968).

Coleman, James S.; Thomas Hoffer; and Sally Kilgore. *High School Achievement – Public, Catholic and Private Schools Compared*. (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

Coleman, James S. and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Office Of Education, 1966).

Curtis, Charles K., and James P. Shaver. "Improving Slow Learners' Self-Esteem in Secondary Social Studies Classes", *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 74 (1981), pp. 217-22.

Fiske, Edward B. "School Study Said to Fail to Emphasize Main Point", *New York Times*, April 26, 1981.

Heal, K. H. "Misbehaviour Among School Children: The Role of the School in Strategies for Prevention", *Policy and Politics*, Vol. 6 (1978).

Hemmings, Madeleine B. Memorandum: "Making American Schools Work Again", December 14, 1981.

Jaques, Elliot. *The Changing Culture of a Factory* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1951).

Jencks, Christopher. *Who Gets Ahead? The Determinants of Economic Success* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

Maeroff, Gene I. *Don't Blame the Kids: The Trouble with America's Public Schools* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981).

Nathan, Joe and Herbert Kohl. "Public Alternative Schools and the Future of Democracy", *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1981.

National Center for Educational Statistics. *The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983).

National Commission on Excellence in Education. "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform", reprinted in *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 4, 1983.

O'Toole, James. *Work, Learning, and the American Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977).

Ravitch, Diane. "What Makes a Good School?": *Society*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (January/February 1982).

Reynolds, David; D. Jones; and S. St. Leger. "Schools Do Make a Difference", *New Society*, Vol. 37 (1976).

Rutter, Michael; Barbara Maughan; Peter Mortimore; Janet Ouston; with Alan Smith. *Fifteen Thousand Hours – Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979).

Samuelson, Robert J. "Schooling and Education", *National Journal*, April 9, 1983, p. 754.

Savage, David G. "The Federal Schoolhouse", *The New Republic*, April 18, 1981.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crises in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970).

Stallings, Jane A., "What Teachers Do Does Make a Difference", in Arthur J. Newman, ed., *In Defense of the American Public School* (Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan, 1978, p. 199).

Thurow, Lester C. "Vocational Education as a Strategy for Eliminating Poverty", in *The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study*, Vocational Education Study Publication No. 1, National Institute of Education, April 1979.

Tobias, Sheila. *Overcoming Math Anxiety*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, *National Assessment of Educational Progress, Three National Assessments of Reading: Changes in Performance, 1970-1980*, summary no. 11-R-35.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, *National Assessment of Educational Progress*.

Vaillant, George E. and Caroline O., "Natural History of Male Psychological Health, X: Work as a Predictor of Positive Mental Health". *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 138 (1981), pp. 1433-40.

NATIONAL CHAMBER FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS

STRATEGIES FOR HISPANIC BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

This three mongraph report, which is the culmination of a three-year study, examines the past growth, current status and future potential of the Hispanic business community in the United States, a segment largely unknown to or misunderstood by American business as a whole. The report's author Dr. Richard Arellano, a former State Department official, states that the Hispanic business community is an underutilized national resource with tremendous potential. It is clearly in the interest of the entire nation to see the Hispanic business sector reach its full potential. NCF's report details specific actions which should be undertaken by the Hispanic community, the American business sector and the U.S. government to achieve this end. ($40.00)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND AMERICAN BUSINESS

America's immigration problem is rapidly reaching crisis proportions. Dr. Michael Teitelbaum's *Immigration, Refugees, and American Business* dissects this complex issue and analyzes how current U.S. immigration policy affects our nation's business community. This report recommends new private and public sector approaches to this controversial problem. ($6.50)

MAKING U.S. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

This report discusses ways that the United States can better coordinate the various aspects of its internatioal trade policies, much the same way that it now coordinates all decisions affecting our nation's defense. Robert Hormats, formerly Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, is the author of the report, which NCF released in March 1984. ($6.50)

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE STRATEGY

Five monographs entitled:

- **How Business Interacts With the Health Care System**
  (includes a special plan for smaller businesses)
- **How Business Can Use Specific Techniques to Control Health Care Costs**
- **How Business Can Stimulate a Competitive Health Care System**
- **How Businesses Can Promote Good Health for Employees and Their Families**
- **How Business Can Improve Health Planning and Regulation**
  ($27.00 per set; $7.00 for individual monographs)

TRANSPORT TOMORROW: A NATIONAL PRIORITY*

Transportation: Forces of Change

This segment describes the state of our transportation systems and discusses problems in six areas: infrastructure, regulation, energy, technology, productivity, and personal mobility.

A Prescription For Effective Transportation Policies

This second monograph sets out principles and guidelines for formulating policy in these six areas. ($16.95 for set of two monographs)

Transport Tomorrow: What Must Be Done

This monograph is the eagerly awaited third and final installment in NCF's *Transport Tomorrow* series. A task force of transportation executives from all segments of the transportation industry guided the project which focused on the proper roles of local and state governments, user participation, and the specific problems of the various modes. ($10.95)

Transport Tomorrow Conference Proceedings

This report contains the stimulating and controversial proceedings from a national conference focusing on a private sector view of national transportation policy strategies. ($8.95)
*The complete *Transport Tomorrow* series is available for $29.95.

THE LAW OF PRODUCT LIABILITY: PROBLEMS AND POLICIES

This study, prepared by the Legislative Drafting Research Fund of Columbia University, examines ways of making our nation's product liability laws less burdensome to industry without endangering the consumer. Preliminary drafts of the report convinced the Department of Commerce to revise its proposed model product liability law for the states. ($22.95 for hard cover; $15.95 for soft cover)

MINIMUM WAGE REGULATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Economist Belton Fleisher has produced this readable analysis of the effects of minimum wage laws in the United States. In addition to disproving several commonly held beliefs about the minimum wage, Dr. Fleisher's monograph offers some realistic proposals designed to restructure our nation's minimum wage policies. ($9.50)

TAX ALTERNATIVES FOR AMERICA

NCF recently completed its investigation of alternative tax systems, prepared in conjunction with the Hudson Institute. The paper assesses several proposed alternatives designed to create a fairer and more equitable U.S. tax system, and includes a detailed analysis of the various formulas for a flat-rate tax, with commentary by a variety of economists, tax experts, and political leaders. ($9.50)

COMPETING: THE ENTERPRISE OF BUSINESS

This book is a probing and original examination of the role of big business in the American economy. ($12.95)

CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY IN THE EIGHTIES

A monograph containing expert advice for those who give or seek funds.

WHAT DIRECTION? CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY

This monograph sets forth the proceedings from a National Chamber Foundation conference. ($11.95 for set of two monographs)

SOON TO BE RELEASED
THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF SPACE

The National Chamber Foundation is working closely with key researchers and a task force of top industry executives to develop a detailed comprehensive plan to stimulate private commercial activity in space. The final report will be a concise policy document offering recommendations on how to develop space as a business area.

A STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING THE PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

NCF is currently engaged in studying the feasibility of establishing a new instrument of development assistance: a multilateral investment corporation called *The Partnership for African Development* (PAD). The concept was proposed at a recent Rockefeller Foundation conference on African economic development, and adopted by NCF.

For additional copies of this or any NCF report, or for further information about NCF, please contact:

National Chamber Foundation
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
Telephone: (202) 463-5552

$8.50 + 1.50 postage & handling

9/84

Designed and Produced by Marsden, New York, N.Y.